

Col. Carl Herndon Seals, Adjutant General's Department.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Lt. Col. Charles Royal Lehner, Field Artillery (temporary colonel, Army of the United States), with rank from July 1, 1940.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel with rank from January 11, 1942

Lt. Col. William Henry Walmsley Youngs, Cavalry (temporary colonel, Army of the United States).

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from February 4, 1942

Maj. Newton Longfellow, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. Lloyd Barnett, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), subject to examination required by law.

Maj. John Arthur Laird, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. Charles William Steinmetz, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. John Myrddin Davies, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. William Norris White, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Walter Thomas Meyer, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. Wendell Brown McCoy, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. James Edward Duke, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. Martinus Stenseth, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. Rex Kirkland Stoner, Air Corps.

Maj. James Bernard Carroll, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. Thomas Lonnie Gilbert, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. James Douglas Givens, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. Oliver Williams DeGruchy, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

Maj. Harold DeLancey Stetson, Quartermaster Corps.

Maj. William Cushman Farnum, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. William Turnbull, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. Joseph Williams Benson, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. Frederick Dan Lynch, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. James Atwater Woodruff, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps).

Maj. Robert Wallace Burke, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from February 12, 1942

Maj. Lester James Maitland, Air Corps. *To be lieutenant colonel with rank from February 15, 1942*

Maj. John Andrews MacLaughlin, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major

Capt. Matthew Corell Pugsley, Medical Corps (temporary major, Army of the United States), with rank from February 6, 1942.

To be captains

First Lt. John Randolph Hall, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from February 11, 1942.

First Lt. Lucie Ernest Gatto, Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from February 12, 1942.

First Lt. David Harry Naimark, Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from February 14, 1942.

First Lt. Jerome Dudley Textor, Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from February 24, 1942, subject to examination required by law.

First Lt. William Leroy Vogt, Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from February 24, 1942.

First Lt. Robert H. Looney, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from February 24, 1942.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Lee Stanley Fountain, Dental Corps, with rank from February 23, 1942.

Lt. Col. John Lloyd Schock, Dental Corps (temporary colonel, Army of the United States), with rank from February 24, 1942.

Lt. Col. Charles Walter Lewis, Dental Corps, with rank from February 25, 1942, subject to examination required by law.

To be captain

First Lt. George Henry Parrot, Jr., Dental Corps (temporary captain, Army of the United States), with rank from February 23, 1942.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. Thomas Matthews Robins (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Assistant to the Chief of Engineers.

Brig. Gen. Brehon Burke Somervell (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Carl Spaatz (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Assistant to the Chief of the Air Corps.

Brig. Gen. Sherman Miles, United States Army.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. David McCoach, Jr., Corps of Engineers.

Col. James Arthur Code, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Roger Baldwin Colton, Signal Corps. Col. Robert McGowan Littlejohn (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Henry Spiese Aurand (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Hugh Chapman Minton (lieutenant colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Alexander Willson, Chemical Warfare Service.

Col. Paul Xavier English (lieutenant colonel, Chemical Warfare Service), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Clark Hillman, Medical Corps. Col. Frederick William Browne, Finance Department.

Col. Haig Shekerjian, Chemical Warfare Service.

Col. Isaac Spalding (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Leven Cooper Allen (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Edwin Colyer McNeill, Judge Advocate General's Department.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 28 (legislative day of January 23), 1942:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Robert H. O'Brien to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

George A. Cook to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Clovis E. Martin to be a passed assistant dental surgeon, to rank from February 13, 1942.

POSTMASTERS

MINNESOTA

Mathew T. Huss, Fairmont.

Amelia M. Eddy, Orr.

Mike J. Leonard, Plainview.

Maurice A. Marchand, Rice.

Evelyn A. Swenson, Warren.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Earl Larus Naiden

Philip Ries Faymonville

Arthur Riehl Wilson

Patrick Jay Hurley

TO BE A MAJOR GENERAL

Julian Francis Barnes

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

To be a lieutenant colonel

William L. McKittrick

To be a major

Robert B. Luckey

To be captains

Malcolm O. Donohoo

Ellsworth G. Van Orman

To be second lieutenants

Elbert S. Maloney, Jr.

Harold "K" Throneson

Quintin A. Bradley

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 28, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord of life and King of glory, we thank Thee for Thy guidance and strength when our own wisdom and understanding fail. How wonderfully Thou hast led us as a people; in war and in pestilence, in loss and in panic Thou hast saved and blest us. When the darkness clouded Thee and Thy hand seemed heavy, in Thy providence Thou didst

temper the storm and didst bring us into the harbor of unity and security.

We praised Thee for the men of old who dreamed dreams and saw visions and cast their light far into the future to lead us on to grander and larger achievements, that our country might go forward with a safe and unfaltering step. Our Father in heaven, grant that we may see eye to eye and stand shoulder to shoulder and with singleness of heart and purpose forge out of the assaults of evil the shield and breastplate of national brotherhood. We pray Thee to lead us to surrender all dreams of appetite and greed that the purple dawn of everlasting day shall not break upon us in vain. While kindled with a sublime and mighty enthusiasm, do Thou continue to inspire us that we may fulfill our destiny without haste and without pause. In the name of our Saviour and our Elder Brother. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5990) entitled "An act to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies, and for other purposes."

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE AIR ACCIDENTS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 422), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That further expenses of conducting the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 125 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, and continued by House Resolution 403 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, incurred by the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed an additional \$10,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such investigation and study or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short newspaper article on the price-control bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PVT. ROBERT H. BROOKS, NEGRO SOLDIER, FIRST AMERICAN TO FALL IN PHILIPPINES DECEMBER 8

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. MITCHELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial written by Mr. M. E. Garber, editor of the Madison Courier, on the Roberts report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I delivered in Milwaukee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THILL]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CELLER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fly, of the Communications Commission is using a good law to a bad end. He is guilty of a monstrous abuse of power and is rapidly becoming the most dangerous man in the Government. He maintains an active and ambitious Gestapo and is putting shackles on the freedom of thought, press, and speech without restraint.

In the pretended regulation of the broadcasters, which needs regulating, he is breaking down those freedoms which guard all others. He is taking advantage of the stress of the moment to federalize all means of communication.

I have heretofore opposed the investigation of executive departments of the Government, but the Communications Commission, as now operating under Mr. Fly, must be stopped, and I intend offering a resolution for House investigation.

TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATION OF NAVAL SUPPLY DEPOT TO COMMANDANT, TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2028) to amend section 3 (a) of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," approved June 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 800), so as to transfer the administration of the Naval Supply Depot, Oakland, to the commandant, twelfth naval district.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Georgia explain just what this bill does?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under the law the commandant of the Mare Island Navy Yard has jurisdiction of what is known as the supply depot at Oakland, Calif. This transfers that to the commandant of the twelfth naval district. That is all it does.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. He is in better position to exercise authority?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. He is in a better position, because a navy yard is a different operation from a supply depot.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (a) of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," approved June 2, 1939 (53 Stat. 800), is hereby amended by striking out the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That such land shall be used only as a naval supply depot and for no other purpose, and such depot shall be a part of the Naval Operating Base, San Francisco, and shall be so administered by the commandant, twelfth naval district."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1133) to authorize the transfer of lands from the United States to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission under certain conditions, and to accept title to another tract to be transferred to the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to permit the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission about 18 acres of land the Navy does not need out here in the Bethesda neighborhood, where the

naval hospital has been constructed. In lieu thereof, the Maryland highway authority will transfer to the Government a road that runs through the property on which the naval hospital has been built.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. For what will they use this land?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This land the Government is transferring will be used by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission as a continuation of the Rock Creek Park system. It is between Chevy Chase, Md., and Kensington, Md.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When the Navy acquired this property, how much did it pay for it?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I forget, but I think it was, as in the case of all land purchased around here, a very large price. However, I do not recall.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What did the Navy purchase it for?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They purchased it for constructing a naval hospital and medical center. It is beyond the town of Bethesda in Montgomery County, Md.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will they ever have occasion to use this land for that purpose?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They will never have occasion to use it for that purpose, because they have some 200 acres, and this is one end of it that is on the continuation of Connecticut Avenue that runs out to Kensington.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. For this very valuable land we get a road?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is all. A road runs through this property which the Government has bought. We will take that road and give them this property.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And relieve the State of paying the upkeep of that road, I presume.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I imagine we will keep up our own road or do away with the road.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the Department in favor of this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes. This was a Department request and the bill is recommended by the Budget.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. Is the gentleman prepared to say that we are getting value from the State of Maryland for the joint conveyances that are being made?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I would say that the land we are giving is probably worth more in dollars and cents than the roadway and its right-of-way, but it is a part of the planning program and the public will have the benefit of it as a continuation of the Rock Creek Park system.

Mr. DITTER. The point I am making is that this results in the purchase of too much land by the Navy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is probably true.

Mr. DITTER. And the expenditure of a greater sum than should have been required?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. DITTER. By way of compensation, we are now going to be bountiful to the State of Maryland and give them something for which we are not getting a return of equal value.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I would say that as far as dollars and cents are concerned the land we are transferring is worth more than the road and the right-of-way.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is the urgency of this legislation?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The urgency is that the Maryland-National Capital Parks and Planning Commission wants to carry on their work out there.

If there is any objection, let somebody object, because it does not make any difference to me.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Georgia on the theory that the bill would pass by unanimous consent and there would be no controversy about it.

Does the gentleman from Georgia wish to withdraw the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I withdraw the bill, Mr. Speaker.

SALVAGE FACILITIES FOR THE NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6356) to amend the act approved October 24, 1941, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities, and for other purposes"—Public Law Numbered 280, Seventy-seventh Congress—so as to remove the limitation on the sum authorized to be appropriated annually to effectuate the purposes of the act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act approved October 24, 1941, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities, and for other purposes" (Public Law No. 280, 77th Cong.), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such funds as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to remove the limitation of \$3,000,000 which may be appropriated for salvage work. Under a bill we passed in October, a limitation of \$3,000,000 was placed on salvage work. Since an enormous amount of salvage work will have to be done at Pearl Harbor, the Navy Department requests that no limitation be imposed, but that it be left to the Committee on Appropriations as to how much shall be appropriated.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the Navy go ahead and do this work until the Committee on

Appropriations appropriates the money for that purpose?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not know that they will do any of this work, but I presume the Committee on Appropriations will handle the matter immediately inasmuch as the salvage work must go forward. The limit now is \$3,000,000.

Mr. RICH. If this bill is passed, can they go ahead without any limit?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Action must first be taken by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I notice the gentleman has several bills in his hand. I assume he is going to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of all of them?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is there anything in any of them that will grant any annuity or added compensation to any Congressman or Senator?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADVANCEMENT ON THE RETIRED LIST OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1630) to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Navy and Marine Corps. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, retired prior to June 23, 1938, and all staff officers of the Navy who have been or shall be retired on or subsequent to that date, who have been specially commended for their performance of duty in actual combat by the head of the executive department under whose jurisdiction such duty was performed, and who have not been advanced on the retired list under any other provision of law, shall be advanced on the retired list to the rank of the next higher grade with three-fourths of the active-duty pay of the grade in which serving at the time of retirement: *Provided,* That no increased retired pay shall be held to accrue to any such officer prior to the date of approval of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the purpose of the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to extend to 18 officers of the Navy and 21 officers of the Marine Corps the privilege of retiring when they do retire with one rank higher than that which they now hold, due to the fact they have been commended or cited for service in combat with the enemy. Under the act of June 23, 1938, every officer from that time on who is commended by an executive head is

entitled to retire at one rank higher. These 18 officers of the Navy and 21 officers of the Marine Corps were commended prior to the enactment of the law. This is all that the measure does, and it is nothing more than right.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's committee has given consideration to this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The committee has; yes.

Mr. RICH. And you are going to grant these officers compensation that is higher than they would receive if they retired with the rank they now hold?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; it is simply a matter of rank.

Mr. RICH. They will receive the higher pay.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; because all the pay is based on longevity. Pay is not based on rank but the length of service, and these 18 men were commended for outstanding service before the law went into effect. The rule applies to everybody from June 28, 1938, down to date, but these 18 men were commended before the enactment of the law, and we are simply doing for them what we are doing for others from now on.

Mr. RICH. And it will not cost the taxpayers any more money?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I hope it will not.

Mr. RICH. If it does, I shall object, because I think we have gone too far in granting compensation to certain men, and especially Members of Congress, as well as other people in this country, and I shall object—

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It will cost annually \$1,463.75.

Mr. RICH. Then I object. You cannot go on further, you have got to stop somewhere.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

AMENDMENT OF THE SPEED-UP LAW

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6355) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 681), as amended, is amended by striking out, in line 2 the date "June 30, 1942", and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1944", so that the section shall read as follows:

"Sec. 12. The provisions of all preceding sections of this act, as heretofore or hereafter amended or modified, shall terminate June 30, 1944, unless the Congress shall otherwise provide."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Georgia explain this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under the language of what is known as the speed-up law, the act expires 2 years from its date, which was June 1942. The purpose of this bill is to extend the speed-up law from June 1942 to June 1944.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. For the information of the House, what is the speed-up law?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The speed-up law was enacted to permit negotiated contracts and permit the Navy to do certain things for the rapid development of its national defense program. This bill merely extends the life of the restrictions we put on that measure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADVANCEMENT ON RETIRED LIST OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2139) to provide for performance of the duties of chiefs of bureau and the Judge Advocate General in the Navy Department, and the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That during the absence, disability, or a temporary vacancy in the office of the chief of any bureau of the Navy Department or the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, when the assistant to such chief of bureau or the Judge Advocate General is absent or disabled, the heads of the major divisions of such bureau or office shall, unless otherwise directed by the President, perform the duties of the chief of bureau or the Judge Advocate General, in such order as the Secretary of the Navy may direct.

Sec. 2. A line officer on the active list of the Marine Corps may be detailed as assistant to the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps and shall, while so serving, receive the highest pay of his rank. Such assistant to the Major General Commandant, and then the line officers of the Marine Corps on duty at the headquarters of the Marine Corps in the order of seniority, shall, unless otherwise directed by the President, perform the duties of the Major General Commandant during his absence, disability, or in the event of a temporary vacancy in that office.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under the law today the head of the bureau and his assistant are permitted to sign official documents. If he is away, then they are signed by the Chief Clerk. This permits an officer, for instance, in the third rank to sign the papers. The bill is very important.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING PAYMENT OF CERTAIN ALLOWANCES TO RETIRED OFFICERS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1589) to prohibit payment of money allowance for subsistence and rental to retired officers of the Navy or Marine Corps for any period when not employed on active duty, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter money allowances for subsistence and rental shall not accrue to any officer of the Navy or Marine Corps on the retired list for any period during which any such officer is not employed on active duty.

SEC. 2. All laws and parts of laws, insofar as they are in conflict with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, and I particularly invite the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. RICH) to this, this bill is in the interest of economy. There are six officers who, on account of the wording of the law, are entitled, when on retired pay, to draw pay and allowances and pay emoluments. We are taking that away from them.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RICH. That might be a good thing to do.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I did not hear just what the gentleman said.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I stated that under the law today, due to certain wording, six retired officers are permitted to draw subsistence and allowance, and pay emoluments and this is taking that away from them and putting them in the same category with retired officers from now on, who are not permitted to draw this pay.

Mr. SABATH. But this bill applies only to six, and we have a hundred or more of them.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, no; we have not. It applies only to six and that is all there are.

Mr. SABATH. But we have many others who are drawing high compensation.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is a different thing.

Mr. SABATH. Men who have accepted positions with large corporations, and who are receiving from \$25,000 to \$50,000 a year. They should be taken off the pay roll also.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But that is an entirely different matter. This is for the rent of his house. The matter that the gentleman is talking about is a different thing.

Mr. SABATH. I think they should be taken off the list.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

OVERTIME PAY FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES, NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2112) authorizing overtime pay for certain employees for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That compensation for employment in excess of 40 hours in any administrative workweek computed at a rate of one and one-half times the regular rate is hereby authorized to be paid, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, to those employees in the field service of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics

whose overtime services are essential to the national defense program and whose duties are determined by the President to be comparable to the duties of those employees of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Coast Guard, for whom overtime compensation is authorized under existing law and regulations: *Provided*, That in determining the overtime compensation of per annum employees the base pay for 1 day shall be considered to be one three-hundred-and-sixtieth of the respective per annum salaries.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall be effective during the national emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, to exist, and shall terminate June 30, 1943, unless the Congress shall otherwise provide.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What does this bill do?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Under the law today what is known in the Navy service as field employees—architects, engineers, who are engaged in work outside of the District of Columbia—are permitted to draw pay and a half overtime. This bill extends the same privilege to that group of about 125 very highly skilled men who are connected with the National Advisory Committee in the testing work down here at Langley Field. The representatives of Langley Field said that, on account of the high compensation being paid by industry, their skilled men, who work in making their laboratory tests, are being drawn away from them and going to industry, and the result will be that that great laboratory work that is being carried on by this high scientific force in the development of aviation will materially suffer as they lose their personnel because they cannot meet the condition of industry. That is the whole bill.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman is aware there are certain differences with respect to men connected with the Naval Establishment, by which certain ones have privileges of overtime.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. And time and a half, and others do not.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. DITTER. Rather than just legislate for this group connected with Langley Field, might it not be better for the Naval Affairs Committee to go into this problem as a whole in respect to these technical employees, many of whom are connected with the Bureau right here in Washington, and see whether we cannot work out an equitable program which would apply to all?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that when this subject matter was first broached in the committee I stated that I am very much opposed to paying to any Government worker who has a permanent job, together with sick leave and a vacation period, time and a half overtime, because the principle of time and a half overtime is to be applied to a person who labors and not to one who may be engaged in what is known as white-collar work. However, we were confronted there, just as we are confronted here, with the fact that industry is taking away

these skilled people on account of the fact that they are paying higher wages, and we must meet the competition and lessen the evil of time and a half to a limited number of places.

Mr. DITTER. If the gentleman will yield further, the very point that the gentleman now emphasizes is the reason for the suggestion that I make. There are men of the same type identified particularly with the Bureau of Yards and Docks who today are giving the type of service that private enterprise might be glad to get. Yet those men in the Bureau here are discriminated against if this inequitable—and I charge it as inequitable—program of compensation prevails. It seems to me we ought to establish a standard of equity to all.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That may be, but I certainly hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not insist on establishing as a uniform rule that all Government clerks who work over a certain number of hours shall get time and a half overtime.

Mr. DITTER. Such a suggestion was not included in the statement I made.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is where it leads to. We are trying to hold it down. There are certain people, such as architects, who may have to have time and a half overtime because no one can step in and take up where his mind has left off. Therefore, he should have time and a half overtime. But certainly no clerk or stenographer, who can stop at any time, should be put on a time-and-a-half overtime basis. If the gentleman is going to object, I trust he will do so immediately, because the Speaker will not permit any further interruption of the day's calendar.

Mr. DITTER. I will not object, but I certainly hope the gentleman will use his influence and endeavor to have technical workers in the Bureau placed on the same basis.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I will say to the gentleman that I will give it proper consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be permitted to sit during the session of the House tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WOMEN'S AUXILIARY CORPS FOR THE ARMY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may have until midnight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 6293) relating to women's auxiliary corps for the Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object—and I am not going to object—is there any minority report on that bill?

Mr. MAY. No; it is a unanimous report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE FOREIGN AGENTS' REGISTRATION ACT

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6269) to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we can have some agreement about the division of time upon the consideration of this conference report? I should want at least 30 minutes to discuss the matter with the House, if I may have it. I thought perhaps we could get unanimous consent for an extension of the 1 hour, in order to cover whatever time may be required by the committee and also by others.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] has 1 hour and it is under his control. He can yield to whomever he pleases.

Mr. DIES. We can extend that by unanimous consent. I was wondering how much time the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] would require?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I say to the gentleman that in view of the fact that the responsibility rests upon the managers on the part of the House to assume the burden with reference to this report, I do not see how we can get along with less than 40 minutes.

Mr. DIES. Can the gentleman yield me 20 minutes?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. DIES. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended 10 minutes, making it 1 hour and 10 minutes. That will be only 10 minutes more than is provided under the rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. All of the time is under the disposition of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] to yield as he pleases.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman has agreed to yield me 20 minutes. Then, of course, there will be 10 additional minutes. I am asking for 30 minutes altogether. That will enable the gentleman to yield me 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can do that if he desires.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, what is the request?

The SPEAKER. The request is that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6269) to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the said bill and agree to the same.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
CHARLES F. McLAUGHLIN,
C. E. HANCOCK,

Managers on the part of the House.

JAMES H. HUGHES,
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
JOHN A. DANAHER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6269) to amend the act entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 8, 1938, as amended, submit the following explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon in conference and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The bill passed by the Senate is identical with the bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary to the House.

The bill as reported to the House contained a definition of the word "person" as follows: "(a) The term 'person' includes an individual, partnership, association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals"—

to which was added, by floor amendment, the words: "including, but not limited to, the Communist Party of the United States, the German-American Bund, and Kyffhauserbund;"

The bill as reported to the House contained a definition of "agent of a foreign principal" to include:

"(1) any person who acts or agrees to act, within the United States, as, or who is or holds himself out to be whether or not pursuant to contractual relationship, a public-relations counsel, publicity agent, information-service employee, servant, agent, representative, or attorney for a foreign principal"—

to which was added, by floor amendment, the following:

"(1A) The term 'agent of a foreign principal' includes, but not limited to, Communist Party of the United States, the German-American Bund, and the Kyffhauserbund;"

The bill as reported to the House contained a requirement that the registration statement shall include:

"(1) Registrant's name, principal business address, and all other business addresses in the United States or elsewhere, and all residence addresses, if any;

"(2) Status of the registrant; if an individual, nationality; if a partnership, name, residence addresses, and nationality of each partner and a true and complete copy of its articles of copartnership; if an association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals, the name, residence addresses, and nationality of each director and officer and of each person performing the functions of a director or officer and a

true and complete copy of its charter, articles of incorporation, association, constitution, and bylaws, and amendments thereto; a copy of every other instrument or document and a statement of the terms and conditions of every oral agreement relating to its organization, powers, and purposes; and a statement of its ownership and control;

"(3) A comprehensive statement of the nature of registrant's business; a complete list of registrant's employees, and a statement of the nature of the work of each, unless, and to the extent, this requirement is waived in writing by the Attorney General; the name and address of every foreign principal for whom the registrant is acting, assuming or purporting to act or has agreed to act; the character of the business or other activities of every such foreign principal, and, if any such foreign principal be other than a natural person, a statement of the ownership and control of each; and the extent, if any, to which each such foreign principal is supervised, directed, owned, controlled, financed, or subsidized, in whole or in part, by any government of a foreign country or foreign political party;"

The third floor amendment inserted the words "members, officers, directors" in the paragraph next above, immediately after the word "employees"

The managers on the part of the Senate were of the opinion that its bill, identical with the House bill without the floor amendments, includes every individual, partnership, association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals sought to be included within the scope of the bill by the floor amendments, assuming they are agents of a foreign principal. The managers on the part of the House were compelled to recognize the correctness of that position.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
CHARLES F. McLAUGHLIN,
C. E. HANCOCK,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 70 minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the matter before the House is the conference report on the bill H. R. 6269. This bill came before the House, under a rule, on December 19, 1941. Extensive hearings had been held and it had been carefully considered by the Committee on the Judiciary and had been unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on the Judiciary. The bill amends, expands, and clarifies the so-called McCormack Act of 1938, which required the registration with the Department of State of agents in the United States of foreign principals.

The existing law worked quite satisfactorily, but the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and the Post Office Department all reported that, in order to make the law more effective, it is desirable, if not indeed necessary, that the bill be amended so as to put into it more effective provisions to carry out its intents and purposes. As I have indicated, hearings were held before a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, of which subcommittee I happen to be chairman, and a very complete record was made and printed and was available to the membership. When the bill came before the House on the 19th day of December there was no opposition to the bill itself, there was no opposition to the objectives of the

bill, there was no opposition to the minutia of the bill save and except that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] proposed three amendments. Those three amendments, to which I will presently refer, were adopted by the House; and I might say parenthetically that there was a very meager attendance on the floor at that time and the amendments were adopted, as shown by the vote, by a very small number of Members.

The bill was passed in the Senate in the identical form in which it had been unanimously reported favorably to the House by the Committee on the Judiciary. In other words, it was passed by the Senate without the amendments which had been proposed by the gentleman from Texas and which had been adopted in the House. The bill went to conference and the conferees had before them a disagreement between the Senate and the House on only three amendments. The managers on the part of the House appointed by the Chair, were the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK], and myself. We held a meeting with the conferees on the part of the Senate and after careful consideration and after a full presentation by the managers on the part of the House of the views of the House, and after a presentation to the conference of the request which is implicit in the action of the House that the amendments be consented to, we considered the question and came to the conclusion unanimously that the amendments should not be agreed to. The conference report therefore comes before the House today with a report and a statement in which the managers take the position and recommend to the House that the amendments agreed to in the House and not agreed to in the Senate should not be kept in the bill.

In the bill, under the caption "Definition," there is set forth the characterization of the word "person." A statement of what the word "person" means follows:

(a) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals.

In other words, wherever the word "person" appears in the bill it includes all of the designations I have mentioned. So the word "person" is all inclusive, and it is generally agreed that it is all inclusive.

Under the definition "agent of a foreign principal," there are four extensive paragraphs setting forth the definitions, and in each of these paragraphs the word "person" is used. As an example the first paragraph provides:

Any person who acts or agrees to act, within the United States, as, or who is or holds himself out to be whether or not pursuant to contractual relationship, a public-relations counsel, publicity agent, information-service employee, servant, agent, representative, or attorney for a foreign principal.

This bill is so inclusive that it is not possible to conceive of any individual, organization, association, corporation, or any other combination of individuals which would not be included in the term "person." There is not any

necessity to extend or enlarge the definition of the word "person." In fact, it would not be possible, by any alleged purported or attempted amendment of the definition of the word "person" to enlarge or extend such definition. The fact is that the definition is all embracing and all inclusive.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. It also includes any foreign government or any foreign political party.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Oh, yes. The bill specifically provides that the term "foreign principal" includes "a government of a foreign country and a foreign political party."

Mr. McCORMACK. I know, because I am the author of the original law. It is all-embracing, all-inclusive. There are absolutely no exemptions. That is so under existing law, and these amendments strengthen existing law.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is entirely true. In other words, to repeat, the word "person" wherever used as designation of an agent of a foreign principal in this bill is all-inclusive. If you would designate any number of individual persons or organizations as a part of the definition of "person," you would not add a single thing to this bill, because the word "person," as defined in the bill, is so all-inclusive and comprehensive that nothing which might be added could possibly add to the term "person."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] proposed and the House adopted an amendment to the definition of the word "person," as follows: After a statement of the definition of the term "person" to which I have referred, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] suggested this amendment: "including but not limited to the Communist Party of America, the German-American Bund, and Kyffhauserbund."

Regardless of how we may feel about these organizations, there is no necessity to put these names in. It adds nothing to the bill. The same is true of the definition of an agent of a foreign principal, where the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], and adopted by the House, provided it shall include but not be limited to the Communist Party of the United States, the German-American Bund, and the Kyffhauserbund.

There is no addition made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] in his amendment. Regardless of how we may feel toward any of these organizations, the bill as it appeared before his amendments were adopted and as it will be enforced if enacted into law without these amendments includes these various organizations, and there is no necessity for the inclusion of them by specification. Their inclusion would add nothing whatever to the bill.

The same argument applies to the third amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, at the proper time I shall offer a motion to recommit the conference report, with instructions to the House managers to insist upon the amendments which the House adopted and which specifically require the Communist Party of the United States, the German-American Bund, and the Kyffhauserbund to register under the terms of this act and to furnish the names of their officers and members. The House and Senate conferees struck these amendments from the pending bill.

If the House passes this bill without the amendments which were adopted when the bill was before the House, the bill will fail to reach the large class of foreign agents in this country. When I offered these amendments they were opposed on the ground that they constitute a violation of the constitutional provision against bills of attainder. I have carefully briefed the question, and I am certain that these objections are not valid. I do not believe that any Member who will examine the question will conclude that there is any question of bills of attainder involved in the wording of these amendments. However, I suggested to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee that if the conferees objected to the language of the amendments because the Communist Party, the Kyffhauserbund, and the German-American Bund were mentioned by names that I would agree to an amendment which merely provides that any organization which teaches or advocates communism, fascism, or nazism shall be required to register under the terms of the bill and furnish the names of their officers and members. I assume that this did not meet with the objection of the conferees.

The bill as it now stands, after my amendments were stricken from it, will not include these foreign-controlled political organizations. The bill adds nothing to the Voorhis Act and the McCormack Act insofar as these organizations are concerned. To avoid the provisions of the Voorhis Act, the Communist Party, at its national convention, passed a resolution pretending to separate itself from the Communist International in Moscow. The insincerity of this resolution was demonstrated by the fact that previous to its adoption the Communist Party had always vigorously denied its control by the Communist International. However, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities has conclusively shown, not only by independent testimony and evidence but also by admissions of the Communist leaders that the Communist Party of the United States is dominated and controlled by the Communist International. It was because of this evidence and the unanimous findings of our committee that the Communist Party resorted to the subterfuge of a formal resolution of separation to escape any legislative requirement that would compel them to disclose the names of their members.

These foreign-controlled political organizations will, of course, resist every effort to compel them to disclose the names of their members because they know that many of their members hold key positions in the Government, in labor unions, in defense industries, and in numerous other organizations. The disclosure of their membership would embarrass many of these people and destroy the effectiveness of their subversive work. The recognition of this fact no doubt inspired the campaign of opposition to my amendments which the Communist Party has carried on so strenuously in the past few weeks. Several days ago I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a front-page article from the Daily Worker, the official publication of the Communist Party. This article recited the activities of the Communists in opposing my amendments and the Communist front organizations that had joined them in the effort.

There seems to be a sincere belief on the part of some that my amendments will antagonize the Soviet Union and, to some extent, embarrass our war efforts. While I respect the opinions of those who sincerely hold this view, I am compelled to disagree with them with all the force at my command. If the Communist Party is sincere in its formal declaration that there is no connection between it and the Soviet Union, or any agency of the Soviet Union, why should the Soviet Union be offended when we require the Communist Party of the United States to register and furnish certain information? The majority of Communist members are citizens of the United States and the organization exists in our own country. Have we come to the time when we dare not legislate with reference to a domestic organization that is made up of our citizens and operating on our own shores, and which claims to have no connection with a foreign government, because someone fears that our action may displease some foreign dictator? There are those who feel that it has become indelicate even to speak of the Communist "fifth column." Such persons seem to think that the Russians' heroic fight against the invading Nazi hordes is good ground for closing our eyes to the nature and ultimate aims of the Communist Party of the United States. Such a view is, in my opinion, wholly devoid of logic. Hitler's complete annihilation at the hands of the Russian armies would not make communism one iota more compatible with the American way of life. Now is the time to look that fact squarely in the face. In concert with many and varied peoples and governments throughout the world, we have undertaken the task of destroying Hitlerism. It is no part of that enterprise that we embrace communism. Neither is it any part of that enterprise that we permit Communists to entrench themselves more deeply in our life and institutions, or to fail to take adequate measures against their subversive activities and propaganda.

The determination of the Russian people to drive Hitler's armies from their soil is a thing which we applaud wholeheartedly. The assistance of the Russian armies in destroying Hitlerism is a

matter which we welcome unreservedly. But these things have nothing whatever to do with our firm conviction that the spread of communism to new territories would be in the nature of unmitigated tragedy. Communism as an international movement reaching its tentacles into our land is a thing which we condemn as much in 1942 as we did in 1938.

The whole matter may be viewed with the frankest realism. Stalin is not fighting Hitler because he has been converted from communism to democracy. He is fighting Hitler because Hitler invaded Russia. That is Stalin's interest in the destruction of Hitlerism. We, too, have staked everything upon the destruction of Hitlerism, but for reasons which are strictly our own and not Stalin's. The destruction of Hitlerism is the one and only point on which the interests of the Soviet Union and the interests of the United States converge, and we may be sure that Stalin himself views the matter in this light.

All that my amendments require is that these foreign-controlled political organizations be required to register and furnish the names of their members and officers and certain other information required by the act. This is certainly a very moderate and reasonable provision when we consider that other democracies, such as Canada, have either outlawed the Communist Party altogether or drastically restricted its activity. England is in much graver peril than the United States and yet England suspended the publication of the London Daily Worker, the official publication of the Communist Party of England, and practically outlawed the Communist Party of England by restrictive measures. When we contrast this attitude in the interest of the English people with our own we find a remarkable difference of policy. The Communist Party of the United States certainly has no right to complain. It has been coddled in this country as in no other country on earth with the exception of Russia. Communists have been exposed by our committee in key positions in the Government and in certain labor unions. We have shown by incontrovertible evidence that members of the Communist Party have repeatedly violated the laws of our land with impunity. We have shown that the Soviet government, through its diplomatic representatives and agents, has violated every provision of the agreement under which we recognized Russia. We have proved beyond any dispute that many strikes in our defense industries have been instigated and engineered by members of the Communist Party of the United States for the purpose of sabotaging our preparedness program.

Out of all the mass of detailed evidence which has been presented to the Committee on Un-American Activities in 4 years of its existence, there has emerged one fact the importance of which probably exceeds that of all others—the Communist Party is an agency for the planning and perpetration of misdemeanors and high crimes. The crimes and misdemeanors of the Communist Party belong in a special class. Behind the Communist violations of our statutes there is a special motive which requires a special

kind of understanding. The Communist criminal is not an ordinary criminal even when he is committing ordinary crimes. The extraordinary thing about a Communist is that it rests upon an elaborate philosophy which is summed up in the doctrine that the end justifies the means. Lenin himself made this perfectly clear when he said:

Revolutionaries who are unable to combine illegal forms of struggle with every form of legal struggle are very poor revolutionaries.

What I have said explains why, as the result of our exposure, Earl Browder has been convicted and sentenced for obtaining a United States passport through fraud. It explains why William Weiner, head of the International Workers' Order and financial secretary of the Communist Party, has been convicted and sentenced for fraudulently representing himself as an American citizen. It explains why Nicholas Dozenberg, agent of Stalin's secret military intelligence service, has been convicted and sentenced for perjury in obtaining an American passport. It explains why Dr. Valentine Burton, Communist agent for Stalin's counterfeiting ring, is now serving a sentence in the Federal prison in Lewisburg, Pa. It explains why the Communist Party practices fraud on a large scale in obtaining signatures for its election petitions.

As a result of our exposure many of them have been indicted and convicted for this offense. It explains why Communists defied our laws to recruit 4,000 American boys to send them to fight in Spain.

For 4 years I have tried to bring home to all Government officials the criminal character of the Communist Party. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities has found unanimously that the Communist Party is a "foreign conspiracy masked as a political party." This means that the Communist Party members who are subject to a strict party discipline in all their activities are foreign conspirators who cannot honorably or honestly serve the American Government.

Whether a dictator-controlled political organization has a million dues-paying members or only 10,000 is relatively unimportant when we consider what havoc a single act of treason committed by a single individual may work under the conditions of modern civilization. And yet the Communist Party, the Kyffhausbund, and the German-American Bund have put themselves on record again and again with respect to their intentions of disloyalty to the American Government and with respect to their actual loyalty to foreign states.

If I had my way I would outlaw these organizations, because I do not believe that any foreign-controlled political organization which serves as a smoke screen for fifth-column activities should be permitted to exist in America. But I know, as you know, that there is not the slightest chance of getting this done now. But it does seem to me that the least we can do is to require these organizations to register and furnish pertinent information.

Does anyone think for a moment that Stalin would tolerate on Russian soil an American organization to promote the

principles of Americanism? Does anyone think for a moment that Stalin would permit Americans or people who believe in Americanism to occupy positions of importance in his government, in labor unions, and in his defense industries? It is ridiculous to even propound such questions.

President Roosevelt in his memorable address to Congress said that we cannot compromise with evil. The Communist Party in this country is an evil organization, preaching atheism, contempt for all authority, and the overthrow of our Government by force and violence. Nazism as represented by the German-American Bund and the Kyffhausbund is equally bad. All of them represent organized treason, actual or potential. In our natural desire to conciliate all forces that are opposing Hitlerism and to unite in a common struggle to defeat the Axis Powers, let us not forget that our first duty is to America. Let us be as vigilant and zealous in the protection of the American way of life as Stalin is in the protection of his Communist way of life. Stalin is not fighting for America to help America; he is fighting against Hitlerism to save Russia.

A fear of displeasing foreign powers and a maudlin attitude toward fifth columnists was largely responsible for the unparalleled tragedy at Pearl Harbor. The lives of more than 2,000 American boys were snuffed out and we suffered a set-back which may require the lives of thousands of American boys to overcome. It would seem that this tragic experience would produce prompt and vigorous measures against our internal enemies.

In a few weeks our committee will release a full report on Japanese espionage and sabotage. This report will contain many official letters and it will disclose that if our committee had been permitted to reveal the facts last September the tragedy of Pearl Harbor might have been averted.

Mr. Speaker, I was amazed when I heard the gentleman from New York suggest that if the F. B. I. had had the power to tap telephones it could have gotten the information and prevented the tragedy at Pearl Harbor. May I say that our committee had all the information in its files as long ago as last September, and when we file our report containing photostat copies of exhibits, showing what a commercial attaché was reporting to us, and what we in turn reported to our officials, when we make public the letters and communications of some top-ranking officials; the American people, in my opinion, will have a true picture of the official attitude in Washington toward the whole fifth column in this country.

The letters and documents in our possession may shed more light on the true situation than anything that has yet been made public. It will reveal the true attitude of official Washington toward the whole fifth-column question in all of its aspects. That, of course, is water over the dam. What is important, however, is that there be an immediate end to this suicidal policy of coddling the tools and dupes of foreign powers. No nation can defeat the uniformed soldiers of the enemy unless it first defeats the

un-uniformed and secret soldiers of the enemy in its midst. The history of every country in Europe has demonstrated this simple truth.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, it is important to defend ourselves against the uniformed soldiers of the enemy from without, but it is equally important to defend ourselves against the un-uniformed and secret armies of dictator countries that are within.

I now make this prediction, Mr. Speaker, and I do so deliberately, that unless this Government adopts an alert attitude toward this whole question there will occur on the west coast a tragedy which will make Pearl Harbor sink into insignificance compared with it. I speak with all of the sincerity that is in my heart when I urge this Congress and this administration to view this question not from an attitude of coddling people or of maudlin sentiment, but to view it from the standpoint of the preservation of America and American institutions.

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Nearly everyone agrees generally with what the gentleman has to say. I would like to know what his answer is to the argument that this language is surplusage.

Mr. DIES. That is easy to answer. The answer is very obvious.

Mr. WALTER. It is not obvious.

Mr. DIES. You passed the Voorhis Act and the McCormack Act. The Communist Party in order to get around those acts adopted a formal resolution when they met in national convention that stated, "We have separated ourselves from the Communist International."

If you strike out my first amendment, including these organizations by name, still there is nothing in the bill requiring any organization to file the names of its officers and members.

Mr. WALTER. I disagree with the gentleman. The term "person" in the act includes an individual, partnership, association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals.

Mr. DIES. I am familiar with that, but I have given the gentleman the answer that even if that includes the Communist Party—and, of course, it will never be enforced against them unless you mention them by name—still it does not require them to furnish the names of their officers and members.

Nothing in the bill does that in the absence of my amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman states that it may happen that after this war we shall strike another depression, when disaster and distress are all over the country. If we permit these persons to continue to extend their tentacles into our society and lay their foundations, will they not have a better chance after the war is over than they have now?

Mr. DIES. We have the illustration that less than one-half of 1 percent of the people of Russia belonged to the Communist Party, yet they seized control of the nation in a moment of chaos. Hitler's Nazi Party never had over 2,000,000 members, but by strong-arm methods and by appeal to racial hatred he was able to seize control of the government during the chaotic conditions in the last days of the republic.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. If this language be merely surplusage, then why the opposition of the Communist sympathizers to its going into the bill?

Mr. DIES. I think frankly that—well, I shall not say why I think the opposition is there.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman stated that he and his committee had information in September which, if it had been acted upon, would have meant that the disaster at Pearl Harbor would have been avoided.

Mr. DIES. That is right.

Mr. SABATH. Has the gentleman given that information to the War Department and the Navy Department?

Mr. DIES. Every day for months representatives of every agency have been in our office at our invitation making copies of our records and of our files. The Military Intelligence have gotten it all. We make our records available to everyone.

Mr. SABATH. So they did have that information; and notwithstanding that, this disaster occurred?

Mr. DIES. It occurred because the proper measures were not put into effect in Hawaii to prevent a series of acts of espionage and sabotage which enabled the Japanese to know definitely when our ships were in the harbor, to know our patrol range, and to have possession of all pertinent information so they could successfully attack us and bring about the destruction of part of our fleet.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman's amendments do not relate to the Japanese in any way, shape, nor form.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does not the gentleman believe it would be well that we place in the language he is now proposing the word "Shintoism," which applies to a particular Japanese organization, just as Communist and bund refer to the other organizations, and that organization is just as detrimental to this Nation's welfare as they are.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman will find that in our report.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Is the gentleman familiar with the series of statutes which

were passed by various States after the Civil War which precluded priests and ministers from preaching and lawyers from practicing, as a class, unless they took an oath that they had not participated in the rebellion? The Supreme Court held that legislation against a class was a bill of attainder. Would not that be in the same class as the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. DIES. What has that to do with an organization that is controlled from abroad?

Mr. CELLER. Yes; but the gentleman would legislate against a class, not against individuals.

Mr. DIES. A bill of attainder is the imposition of punishment without trial or without any provision for a trial. Of course, my amendments do not attempt to do this.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, permit me to say that I have cooperated in every way possible with the Secretary of State and the administration in our war efforts and our defense program. But in this instance I am convinced that the Secretary of State and the administration are wrong. In a short time we will find out who is right and who is wrong. If, as the Judiciary Committee contends, this bill applies to the Communist Party, the Kyfferhauserbund, and the German-American Bund, the Department of Justice will proceed without delay to prosecute these organizations under the terms of the act. If they fail to prosecute these organizations, it will mean that either the act as written does not apply to the organizations or that the Department of Justice refuses to enforce the act against them.

It is my prediction that the Communist Party will never be prosecuted under this act if the House permits the conferees to take my amendments out of the bill. As for me, I dare not relax my vigilance. I have already had one experience which is enough. Last September our committee subpoenaed a number of witnesses to appear in Washington to expose Japanese fifth-column activities in the United States. The Secretary of State, the Department of Justice, and the President strenuously opposed the exposure of these activities. I told the Secretary of State that the situation was very serious and that prompt and effective measures should be taken. I refused to take the responsibility for calling off the hearings until I received a letter from the Department of Justice advising me that the President, the Department of Justice, and the Secretary of State were opposed to the hearings. I now regret that I called off the hearings. If those hearings had gone ahead according to schedule I am convinced that the Pearl Harbor tragedy never would have occurred, because we would have made public the plans of the Japanese to seize control of the Pacific. The administration did not want these hearings because it feared that they might offend the Japanese Government. In my anxiety to cooperate with the administration and not do anything that might embarrass it in the conduct of international affairs I yielded to the judgment of our leaders. Subsequent events

proved that they were wrong and that I would have been right had I gone ahead with the hearings.

I am convinced that there are thousands of members of these fifth-column organizations who hold key positions in the Government, defense industries, and in some labor unions. It is of the greatest importance that their identities be established. My amendments will bring about the exposure of these people and enable the Government to protect the country from them. If I should weaken in my efforts to bring about that exposure and another tragedy should occur I would blame myself. Even if these amendments are rejected this debate will accomplish some good purposes. It will show why we have been unable to get effective action against fifth-column organizations in America. It will also make a permanent record of the intention and belief of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees that this bill does apply to the Communist Party, the Kyfferhauserbund and the German-American Bund. If prompt action is not taken to prosecute these organizations under the terms of the act, the people and the Congress will know the truth. I believe it has been stated by proponents of the bill that the Department of Justice helped to write the bill. I have heard it said that, as a matter of fact, they wrote the bill. Undoubtedly the Department of Justice advised the Senate and House conferees that the bill does apply to these organizations, otherwise these committees would not make the statement that these organizations come within the meaning of the act.

The issue is, therefore, made so clear that there can be no further alibis or excuses. Either these organizations will be prosecuted immediately or the people will have a right to believe that there is no official disposition to prosecute fifth columnists in this country. It is my personal opinion that no action will be taken under this act against these organizations. The McCormack Act has been on the statute books for a long time. The Voorhis Act has been on the statute books for several years. The language of those two acts are just as strong and clear with reference to these organizations as is the language of the pending bill. Years ago I asked the Department of Justice to enforce the law against these fifth-column organizations. I submitted our evidence showing that these organizations are agents of foreign powers. At that time Stalin was not fighting Hitler. During part of that period Stalin was fighting with Hitler, and yet no action was taken to enforce this law against the Communist Party. How can I believe, therefore, that the present attitude is caused by our participation in the war when it is no different than the previous attitude during the very time that Stalin was Hitler's ally. At any rate, the immediate future will prove whether I am right or wrong in this matter. For the sake of our security I hope that I am wrong and that constant exposure by our committee and the fight we are making will bring about a change in official attitude while there is still time.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think I can claim with a little modesty, and I am sure it will not be construed as a boastful expression, to have some knowledge of the law which the present bill undertakes to amend. I drafted, in conjunction with the other members of the special committee, the law that is on the statute books. I see here my good friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER], who was a member of the special committee as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]. This law followed the recommendation of the special committee of several years ago, of which I was chairman, that investigated communism, nazi-ism, and all other subversive "isms," as well as bigotry, which to me is almost as repulsive as a direct subversive activity, because the results of bigotry bring about a division of the people and are subversive in their nature. That law covers everyone. The bill under consideration, to amend the existing law, is intended to strengthen the existing law.

When I introduced the bill as a result of the recommendations of the special committee, we had powerful opposition. It took quite a long while to get that bill through. The Committee on the Judiciary reported it out in one Congress and we could not get a rule out of the Rules Committee. I know because I tried. I could not get a rule from the Rules Committee. I could not get a hearing. That shows how much opposition there was to the bill that is now on the statute books which means so much to our country.

In any event, the present law, with the proposed amendment, covers everybody. It covers the very organizations that my friend from Texas talks about. Certainly no one is more vigorous in his opposition to subversive activities in this country than I am, or more vigorous in opposition to intolerance in any form, no matter where it emanates, and I agree with everything my friend from Texas has said along such lines. So far as I am concerned, I am for the extension of his committee. That is where I stand. The committee can do a lot of effective service even in war. They can go in and get records and papers that departments of government cannot get without the necessity of a search warrant, and so forth, and they can permit other departments of government to examine those records and get evidence upon which to make their own independent investigations.

We all agree with everything the gentleman from Texas has said, but that is not the point here today. We are at war and we have got to be practical. The existing law covers the organizations that the gentleman attempts to put into the present bill by specifically referring to them. The present or pending bill covers them. The present bill strengthens the McCormack Act. I was experimenting at that time, and, naturally, when you are experimenting you cannot go as far as you can after you have had experience, and in the light of the experience gained from the administration of the McCormack Act, these amendments are necessary to strengthen the act for the best interests of our country.

These amendments were submitted to me by the Department. I would have gladly introduced the bill; but, coming from the Department, I said the regular procedure must be followed of taking it up with the chairman of the committee, and I knew that the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, would introduce the bill. But I stated that if for some reason he could not see his way clear to do so, I would gladly introduce a bill such as we are considering here today.

Reference has been made here to the registration or the list of names. If you will read the McCormack Act and this bill, there is broad power to issue rules and regulations, and if they cannot do it under the broad power to issue rules and regulations the Dies amendment does not call for the filing of the names of these organizations, and therefore my friend from Texas will not meet that situation by his amendment.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman is wrong. Mr. McCORMACK. That has got to be done by other language.

Mr. DIES. One of the amendments we have here that the House adopted does require the filing of the names of the officers and members.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will accept that correction. But, in any event, the argument the gentleman made is beside the point under consideration today. But the bill covers everything when considered in connection with existing law. We are at war and you and I know that when the law meets the situation the gentleman complains of, without compelling me to make specific reference to the existing world situation, this is not the time to inflame the international situation, particularly that part of the international situation that is beneficial to our own beloved country. Not only should we respect the efforts of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] because his amendments are not necessary, the bill already covering the same, but at this time necessity and sound and practical judgment calls for the defeat of his efforts. I therefore hope the conference report will be agreed to.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, this bill is aimed at agents of foreign principals. Under the bill they are required to register, to identify themselves, and to label their propaganda. If you will read the bill, which is 26 pages long, you will find that an agent is very broadly defined. It may be an individual, partnership, association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals. It is all-inclusive language. Foreign principal is likewise defined in broad general terms. The bill applies not only to Bundists and Communists, but it applies to everybody—Japs, Germans, Frenchmen, Italians—everybody who spreads propaganda for a foreign principal. There is no more sense in specifying Communists and Bundists in this bill than there would be in a statute against murder to say "this includes the Odd Fellows, the Masons, and the Elks."

It is bad form, it is bad legislation, when you are passing a general law, of

universal application, to specify any particular individual or group. It is not only faulty draftsmanship, but it weakens rather than strengthens the legislation. Some good lawyers believe it raises a question of constitutionality. This is the unanimous opinion of the conferees and I may say also of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate and the Judiciary Committee of the House.

I think this is a rather significant fact. It is something that we should not dwell upon too much for diplomatic reasons, but the Department of Justice and the Department of State, and I emphasize that, are opposed to the Dies amendments. There is no reason whatever, unless it is demagoguery, to include the Dies amendments in this bill. They add absolutely nothing to it. The bill covers the ground which we are shooting at in this particular legislation. It is not a bill to prevent sedition or subversive activities. Those subjects are taken care of in other legislation. It is merely a bill to require agents of foreign principals to let us know who they are, and when they send out propaganda to label it as such. That is all there is to it.

I appeal to you gentlemen to give weight to the unanimous opinion of the Committee on the Judiciary of both House and Senate, the Department of State, and the Department of Justice.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes.

Mr. KEAN. In the gentleman's opinion, the adoption of the Dies amendment would hinder rather than help win the war?

Mr. HANCOCK. It would be embarrassing to our Government.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobbs].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, this is not a debating society. It is the Congress of the United States, and it is not only the Congress of the United States but the Congress of the United States in wartime. No one disputes the ability, the transcendental ability, of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dies] to make a speech. He always makes a good one, and he has made a good one here today. We agree with every single word that he has said in advocacy of the most alert and active protection against fifth columnists and all such enemies of the Republic, whether foreign or domestic. That is the sole purpose of this bill.

The distinguished gentleman virtually admits that there is no reason to mention by name the Kyffhauserbund, nor the Communist Party of the United States, nor the German-American Bund. The mudsill and basis of his argument is that the bill which the Committee on the Judiciary reported does not require the listing of the names of the members of offending organizations. That is not so. I read from page 10 of the bill where, if the agent of a foreign government is an individual, he is required to give his name, principal address, and so on; and if the registrant be a partnership, then the name, residence, addresses, and nationality of each partner must be set

forth; and if a corporation, then, it must not only give the names of the directors for the current year, but those active in the direction and management, and, listen to me, also to file a true and complete copy of its charter, or certificate of incorporation. The law of every State requires such certificate to set forth the names and addresses of the incorporators, or members. Hence, if each corporate registrant must file its certificate of incorporation, we would have a list, verified by affidavit, of the original incorporators or members.

Mr. DIES. But that is not the members of the organization.

Mr. HOBBS. That is the members of the organization, and the gentleman's State requires the charter to disclose the membership of any group seeking a charter.

Mr. DIES. But that includes the stockholders, and here is an organization with hundreds of thousands of members, and you do not require that. That is what my amendment requires.

Mr. HOBBS. The gentleman has just evidenced his intimate knowledge of the subject, and his powers of discernment, because that is exactly what I do mean to contend. I call attention to the chapter of the law of the State of the gentleman from Texas. He is a distinguished member of the bar of that State, which says that corporations without capital stock must file in their charter application the names of all of the members composing the organization, and that is the law of every State in the Union that has legislated on the subject. This bill does not require the list of members of a corporation at the time of registration as a propagandist of a foreign authority, but it does require the names of the current managers and directors.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir. I am always happy to yield to my distinguished and lovable colleague from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Is it the contention of my distinguished and lovable colleague that this bill as recommended by the Judiciary Committee in this conference report will require the listing of the officers and the members of the Communist Party and the German-American Bund and the Kyffhauserbund?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir; the officers and directors of every corporation, but only of the original members: In cases of partnerships, the name and address of every partner.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. This does not require the members of those organizations to be brought up to date.

Mr. HOBBS. No, sir; not of corporations.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I wanted to get that clear, because I was afraid the gentleman was leaving that impression.

Mr. HOBBS. I quoted from page 10 what the requirements are.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir; but I have only a very short time.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. What is the gentleman's opinion with regard to the

constitutionality of the act if an organization is mentioned by name? Does that not raise a question as to the constitutionality of the law, by specifying the particular person or group by name? Are we not thereby enacting a bill of attainder? The correct and constitutional procedure is for us to make definitions here and for the courts to interpret those definitions. That is the proper way to legislate.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman for his question. I tried to cover that in my former speech on this subject in opposing the amendments when they were offered. I do not go so far as to say the Constitution would be violated. I think there is a very serious question as to that. Of course, a bill of attainder means more than the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dies] intimated.

A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. "Bills of this sort," says Mr. Justice Story, "have been most usually passed in England in times of rebellion, or of gross subservience to the Crown, or of violent political excitements, periods in which all nations are most liable, as well the free as enslaved, to forget their duties and to trample upon the rights and liberties of others." These bills are generally directed against individuals by name, but they may be directed against a whole class. *Cummings v. Missouri* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 277, 323, 18 L. Ed. 356.)

The term "bill of attainder" within the meaning of the Federal Constitution, included a general statute passed after the Civil War, which required all attorneys at law to take an oath that they had never voluntarily borne arms against the United States, or given aid, countenance, counsel, or encouragement to persons engaged in armed hostilities thereto, as a condition to their right to practice in the Supreme Court of the United States. In this leading case the majority opinion was written by Justice Field, and was based to a large extent upon a prior decision in the same term of *Cummings v. State of Missouri* (4 Wall 277), in which the statute of Missouri, requiring ministers of the gospel to take a similar oath as a condition to their right to exercise the privileges of their profession, was held unconstitutional. Mr. Justice Miller on behalf of himself, the Chief Justice, and Justices Swayne and Davis delivered a dissenting opinion in *Ex parte Garland*, which is expressly made applicable not only to that case but to the case of *Cummings v. State of Missouri*, in which he says "the word 'attainder' is derived by Sir Thomas Tomlins, in his law dictionary, from the words 'attincta' and 'attinctura,' and is defined to be 'the stain or corruption of the blood of a criminal capitally condemned; the immediate inseparable consequence of the common law on the pronouncing the sentence of death. The effect of this corruption of the blood was that the party attainted lost all inheritable quality, and could neither receive nor transmit any property or other rights by inheritance. Upon an attentive examination of the distinctive features of this kind of legislation, I think it will be found that the following comprise those essential elements of bills of attainder, in addition to the one already mentioned, which distinguish them from other legislation, and which made them so obnoxious to the statesmen who organized our Government: (1) They were convictions and sentences pronounced by the legislative department of the Government instead of the judicial. (2) The sentence pronounced and the punishment inflicted were determined by no previous law or fixed rule. (3) The investigation into the guilt of the accused, if

any such were made, was not necessarily or generally conducted in his presence or that of his counsel, and no recognized rule of evidence governed the inquiry." The conclusion of the majority of the Court was denied by the dissenting judges on the ground that the laws in question did not contain the essential requirements, in the definition of "bill of attainder," of working a corruption of blood, or in describing any person or class of persons by name or description. (*Ex parte Garland*, 71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 333, 387, 18 L. Ed. 366.)

A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. If the punishment be less than death, it is a bill of pains and penalties. As the term "bill of attainder" is used in the Federal Constitution, it includes both bills of attainder particularly, and bills of pains and penalties. *Cummings v. Missouri* (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 277, 18 L. Ed. 356); *Drehman v. Stifle* (75 U. S. (8 Wall.), 595, 601, 19 L. Ed. 508); *Pierce v. Carskadon* (83 U. S. (16 Wall.) 234, 239, 21 L. Ed. 276.)

Quoting further from the dissenting opinion in *ex parte Garland*:

It is no cause for wonder that men who had just passed successfully through a desperate struggle in behalf of civil liberty should feel a detestation for legislation of which these were the prominent features. The framers of our political system had a full appreciation of the necessity of keeping separate and distinct the primary departments of the Government. Mr. Hamilton, in the seventy-eighth number of the *Federalist*, says that he agrees with the maxim of Montesquieu, that "There is no liberty if the power of judging be not separated from the legislative and executive powers."

And others of the ablest numbers of that publication are devoted to the purpose of showing that in our Constitution these powers are so justly balanced and restrained that neither will probably be able to make much encroachment upon the others. Nor was it less repugnant to their views of the security of personal rights that any person should be condemned without a hearing and punished without a law previously prescribing the nature and extent of that punishment. They therefore struck boldly at all this machinery of legislative despotism by forbidding the passage of bills of attainder and *ex post facto* laws, both to Congress and to the States.

The dissenting opinion in the *Garland* case attempts to justify its contention by saying that the act of Congress there in question did not contain the name or any designation of a person or persons, and that the barring of attorneys from the practice of their profession who had not taken a prescribed oath was not a punishment for a criminal offense. But the prevailing opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States swept aside these contentions and held the act to be unconstitutional and void, saying:

The statute is directed against parties who have offended in any of the particulars embraced by these clauses, and its object is to exclude them from the profession of the law, or at least from its practice in the courts of the United States. As the oath prescribed cannot be taken by these parties, the act, as against them, operates as a legislative decree of perpetual exclusion, and exclusion from any of the professions or any of the ordinary avocations of life for past conduct can be regarded in no other light than as punishment for such conduct. The exaction of the oath is the mode provided for ascertaining the parties upon whom the act is intended to operate, and, instead of lessening, increases its objectionable character. All enactments

of this kind partake of the nature of bills of pains and penalties, and are subject to the constitutional inhibition against the passage of bills of attainder, under which general designation they are included.

But aside from the question of constitutionality, we are not children. We are not making faces. We are writing law. The traditional, time-honored, and the only acceptable way to write law is to define the class of violators that you are shooting at. This bill does it. It does it abundantly. There is no legitimate criticism.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just wanted to make this observation also, that we are all actors in a serious game today.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman. I want to drive this point home in conclusion: Let us look at this, if you specify by name you may run afoul of the constitutional inhibition against the passage of bills of attainder, but you also provide an easy mode of evasion by a mere change of name.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Roll No. 15		
Andrews	Hook	Ramspeck
Baldwin	Jensen	Rees, Kans.
Bland	Johnson	Romjue
Boehne	Lyndon B.	Schaefer, Ill.
Boggs	Johnson	Scott
Buck	W. Va.	Sheridan
Buckley, N. Y.	Kramer	Somers, N. Y.
Carlson	Lambertson	Sweeney
Elston	Landis	Thomas, N. J.
Fenton	Larrabee	Vreeland
Ford	Magnuson	Ward
Leland M.	Nichols	Wene
Gavagan	O'Day	Welchhel
Haines	O'Hara	Winter
Hébert	Osmer	Worley
Hinschaw	Pierce	Youngdahl
Holbrook	Rabaut	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 383 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

AMENDING THE FOREIGN AGENTS' REGISTRATION ACT

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to conclude with this statement: If you mean business about doing the job that this bill will do, this is the only chance to do it. To vote down the motion that will be made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is the only hope for legislation on this subject by this Congress. The Senate conferees are just as adamant and just as unanimously against it as our conferees have been.

Therefore, no matter what instructions you give our conferees, you will never get the Senate to yield; and, therefore, were you to adopt the Dies motion, you would be killing the only chance to get any bill passed.

Our Nation is at war. We need this bill to become law. It does everything without the Dies amendments that it could possibly do with them. Both Judiciary Committees and all conferees unanimously urge the defeat of the Dies amendments. We must do so.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, as this matter comes before the House in the conference report on the bill H. R. 6269, may I say at the outset of the brief statement which I will have an opportunity to make, this matter was carefully heard and considered by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House, of which I was a member; after full and complete hearings by the subcommittee, and after careful consideration, the bill was reported out of that subcommittee unanimously. This matter then went before the entire Judiciary Committee. After the Judiciary Committee had carefully considered the proposed legislation, a bill was reported unanimously by the committee for passage. It was in the same form that it was passed by the other body, and in the same form as the bill was reported out of the Judiciary Committee. Now the matter comes before us on the conference report, as to whether or not the three amendments, with which you are all familiar, should be inserted in the proposed legislation. These proposed amendments specifically mention the Communist Party of the United States, the German-American Bund, and the Kyffhauserbund.

The question is, at the moment, whether or not this proposed legislation, as it was reported out of the Judiciary Committee, and as it was passed by the other body, is broad enough to embrace all organizations. I am firmly convinced it is. I call your attention, just briefly, to the phraseology of the bill itself which we passed out of the Judiciary Committee and as it was passed by the other body. Listen to this language:

SECTION 1. As used in and for the purposes of this act, (a) the term "person" includes any individual, partnership, association, corporation, organization, or any other combination of individuals.

Pray tell me how much broader that phraseology should have been made? Tell me how much broader the terms of this act could have been made? The language which I have just read and which is a part of the bill itself as it comes before us, is all-inclusive. That language embraces every organization. It includes the very groups which the gentleman from Texas has mentioned.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of my subcommittee.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. During the debate on this bill the gentleman stated:

It is my opinion that the language contained in section 2 of the pending bill is sufficient to embrace the organizations mentioned by the gentleman from Texas.

And again the gentleman stated:

I cannot conceive of any broader language, and it is my firm belief that the language employed in the bill is all-inclusive.

I take it that is the gentleman's view now in discussing the conference report. Am I correct?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. That is my view of this legislation because I feel convinced that the language employed is all-inclusive.

These suggested amendments, Mr. Speaker, are mere surplusage. If we were arguing this question before a court we would refer to these proposed amendments as redundant matter. They are not necessary. The language employed in this bill is so broad and so all-inclusive that it embraces the various organizations my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. DIES] has mentioned and which he desires incorporated by way of amendment in this bill.

There is another point I want to call to your attention very briefly in the statement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is a dangerous undertaking, Mr. Speaker, when we begin to name one, two, or three particular organizations in legislation of this character, and omit naming all of the organizations which we seek to reach. We are advised there are fifty or more organizations of the same complexion, and of the same character, as those to which the distinguished gentleman from Texas refers, but they are not named in this bill. He just seeks to name three—the Communists, the German-American Bund, and the Kyffhauser Bund. We are treading upon dangerous ground when we attempt to name a part of those organizations to which we desire the legislation to apply. Under the construction of statutes by the courts if we name one organization, or more, we are presumed to have named all to which the act will apply. If that course is pursued those which are not named are deemed to be excluded from the provisions of the bill.

We do not wish to pass a bill today which is a mockery and a subterfuge. We must legislate as legislators. While I have ever supported the Dies committee and its splendid service to our Nation—yet we are now in war. We must win this war. We must not knowingly insult any nation which is now engaged in this war as an ally of our own. We must aid our boys, we must aid our cause, and we must encourage every nation which is now engaged in the all-out effort to defeat Germany, Italy, and Japan. I am convinced my distinguished friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] desires to aid in the prosecution of this war to the end that the Axis Powers will suffer ultimate defeat. When we concur in the report of the conferees on this bill I am convinced we will do just that. Let us face this issue as Americans.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 11 minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, very soon you are to cast a vote that may or may not be one of the most important votes ever cast in the House of Representatives, and I should like to begin with the attention of the Members of the House. This is no time for child's play, this is no time to play to the galleries. Today your Nation and my Nation faces the greatest fighting machine of all time. Your Committee on the Judiciary, undertaking to deal with a recognized situation, as your agent brought in a bill here which nobody questions covers every possible agency that could be covered if the Dies amendment were incorporated. Now, think about it. Think about it as sensible people. We have a little partisanship once in a while in our committee, but I compliment the Committee on the Judiciary by saying that whenever they feel the challenge which comes to them as statesmen that committee has never failed to stand together for what they believed to be the best interests of their country.

The Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House are unanimous in their judgment that these amendments ought not to be incorporated in this bill. What have you got us for? What have you got a Committee on the Judiciary for, or any other committee? It studies a question deliberately, contacts the responsible agencies of government, like the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State tells you—and you know it is true, there is not anybody in this House so dumb he does not know it is the truth, we are in no position to be flirting with the situation—the Secretary of State tells us that it is a dangerous thing to incorporate these amendments now. And what do you get out of it? I am talking to you as man to man. What do you get out of it? You do not broaden by one single iota the scope of this bill. You just do what the Secretary of State, the diplomatic representative of the Nation in this crucial time, tells you is against the best interests of the United States to do. What do you mean? I mean it exactly as I say it: What do you mean, individual Members of the House of Representatives, incorporating in a bill every possible agency that could be required and your diplomatic representative, Cordell Hull, the only man you have got to deal with the most delicate diplomatic situation that ever challenged or endangered this country says: "Don't do it"? Do you mean to tell me that you will take the responsibility individually?

Your committee has covered every possible agency that could be covered, and your Secretary of State tells you not to do it. What are you going to do it for? Now, as a matter of just plain practical horse sense, what are you going to do it for? We are not dealing with an ordinary situation. You and I face the responsibility this minute when your Nation and my Nation confronts the greatest danger it has confronted since

our ancestors put their feet on American soil. We are playing with the job, acting like children. Suppose we turn down the Secretary of State, suppose you turn down your Committee on the Judiciary, the unanimous judgment of those persons whom you put on the Committee on the Judiciary. I do not like to interfere with my committee; I would not do it if I did not appreciate the stupendous question that is now pending in this House.

My distinguished colleague from Texas just said:

We have shown that the Soviet Government through its diplomatic representatives and agents has violated every provision of the agreement under which we recognized Russia.

I ask you, as a matter of horse sense, is this any time to be dealing with that sort of a question? They are fighting side by side with America and doing the best fighting of anybody in our crowd just now.

Where are you trying to get to? Suppose we put these amendments in the bill or leave them in the bill at the request of the gentleman who has just spoken those words on the floor of this House, which I have quoted, does anybody mean to tell me that the difficulties of Cordell Hull would not be greater? What are we trying to do? That is what I would like to ask. What are we trying to do? Are we trying to protect this country and make it necessary for every person and every agency that ought to file its name and its principle to be recorded? We do it under the bill. If we are seeking to kick Russia, and that is what we are trying to do—if that is the objective—there is mighty good sense in these amendments, sustained by the language of my distinguished friend from Texas, who said:

We have shown that the Soviet Government, through its diplomatic representatives and agents, has violated every provision of the agreement under which we recognized Russia.

Do you think this is the time to bring up issues like that?

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DIES. At the beginning of our discussion it was agreed that 70 minutes would be devoted to debate.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not yield for that.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman has used 40 minutes. I have only had 25 minutes. As I understand, the gentleman requires some more time. Will he permit me to ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not entertain that request.

Mr. DIES. I thought maybe we could have a little fairness.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. For a very brief question.

Mr. HARE. At the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks I get the idea that the passage of this amendment would involve a new enemy.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I cannot go into that.

Mr. HARE. If the passage of this amendment will involve us with Russia, is that calculated to have a new enemy in this war?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am trying to make it pretty clear and it seems to me I ought not to have to do it again, that any American citizen, whether in this House or anywhere else, who has got really good old-fashioned horse sense, and whose boy is wearing the uniform of our country, whose country is now under attack by the Axis Powers against whom Russia is fighting, should not want to include this language. I cannot for the life of me see why anybody should have any hesitancy in stripping this bill down to the language that deals fully with the situation without embarrassing Cordell Hull in what he is trying to do for us.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen partisanship in this House. I was here during the other war. But when Members have the challenge that comes to you this minute, I have yet to see this center line dividing Democrats and Republicans divide the patriots in this House. Your Republican boy is in uniform, just like the boys of the folks over here on the Democratic side. There is not a human being who can look at this picture, this bloody picture, today and be certain what is going to happen. We do know that we have not one iota of support to throw away. Is that right? Have we any more people fighting on our side or with us than we need?

What are you going to do with these amendments? What do you want them in the bill for? Let us be sensible. What do you want them in there for if we have not something to slough off? Does anybody pretend to believe that if we put those amendments in there, associated with the language of the gentleman from Texas: "We have shown that the Soviet Government through its diplomatic representatives and agents has violated every provision of the agreement under which we recognized Russia," it would make Russia disposed to take a stronger stand against a separate peace? I mean, where is there horse sense in that?

We are not just playing to the galleries. We are faced with the vital interests of this great Nation, at the high peak of human history. When people ask you what of the night, you cannot tell them. You cannot see through the curtain of battle smoke that shrouds the world today.

I appeal to you on behalf of my country and your country that you love as well as I do. The Committee on the Judiciary has studied this thing. We went back into a reexamination of the matter after these amendments were agreed to by the House, and it was the unanimous determination of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, Democrats and Republicans, that we could not afford to incorporate these amendments in this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, we had an understanding that I was to have 30 min-

utes and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] 40 minutes. I have had 25 minutes. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 45 minutes. I ask unanimous consent to answer the gentleman for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that all time agreed upon, 1 hour and 10 minutes, has expired. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to offer a motion?

Mr. DIES. No.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DIES. Yes; I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DIES moves to recommit the conference report with instructions that the House managers insist on the provisions of the House bill relating to the Communist Party of the United States, the German-American Bund, and the Kyffhauserbund and the requirements that these organizations furnish the names of their members and officers.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIES) there were—ayes 40, noes 228.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill and the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper editorial from the St. Louis Argus on the subject I spoke on this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

RELIEF FOR CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS IN STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 419, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6359) granting relief to certain agricultural producers in stricken areas who suffered crop failures in 1941 because of adverse weather conditions, insect pests, or other uncontrollable natural causes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, after I have briefly explained the rule and the bill I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 6359. This is a broad and liberal rule, permitting 2 hours of general debate and providing that at the conclusion of the general debate the bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule and open to amendment.

Originally the Committee on Agriculture reported a bill known as H. R. 6120, but the Committee on Rules, after questioning the chairman and the members of the Committee on Agriculture, felt that that committee should bring in a bill that would embody amendments which the chairman and the various members appearing before our committee agreed be included in the bill.

The bill the consideration of which this rule makes in order, as we have been informed, will cost the Government from \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000. Personally, I am of the opinion, after making investigations, that it will cost a great deal more; in fact, I believe it may reach the sum of \$20,000,000.

Real demand has been made for this proposed legislation by gentlemen representing States which have actually suffered crop failure in the year of 1941 because of adverse weather conditions. I feel that relief should be given to these agricultural producers in the stricken areas.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If it is right to assist the farmer because his crop failed to grow due to a lack of rainfall or for other reasons, would it not be quite as justifiable to assist the automobile dealers, who are not permitted to have tires and who have had to close down their shops? The Government stopped the automobile dealers from doing business but the Lord stopped the crops from growing. Which is the more to blame? If a payment by the Federal Government to one is justifiable, should not payment by the Government to the other also be justifiable?

Mr. SABATH. There is a great deal to what the gentleman states. That question was uppermost in the minds of

the Committee on Rules before granting the rule. However, I and the committee have promised the House that whenever a standing committee of the House reports a bill the Members of the House should have the right and privilege to vote on it. It is because of that desire not to deprive the Members of the House of their right and privilege to vote on these bills that the rule has been granted.

I concede that there have been some losses on the part of some of the farmers in the South as well as in certain New York areas. A plea has been made in behalf of those farmers who have lost their crops and who may lose their cattle. I have pointed out that there are many agencies of the Government which have been established to aid the farmers of the United States, and they have been authorized to do so. Although I shall vote for this rule, and have called it up, I am afraid this bill sets a dangerous precedent.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman has studied the bill, however?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Would the gentleman support legislation of this kind?

Mr. SABATH. In view of conditions and of the extraordinary plea that has been made by the gentlemen who appeared before the committee, I feel that I should at this time, the same as I have heretofore, vote for legislation that would aid agriculture and the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. RICH. If you continue in the future to pass legislation such as has been proposed by this committee in the past, how are you going to prosecute this war?

Mr. SABATH. It has been stated that it is absolutely necessary to aid the farmers who have sustained these losses, because it may aid in our national defense. Gentlemen representing a certain New York section which suffered due to the drought feel that dairy products are necessary, that there is a shortage of them, that unless this relief is granted the farmers may be unable to feed the cattle and provide the milk and cheese that is necessary for ourselves as well as for those who are aiding us in this crucial moment.

For the purpose of satisfying myself as to what has been done heretofore for the farmers, I have made some investigation of the facts, because they do not seem to be content or satisfied. They maintain we have not done enough for them. I have voted for all these large appropriations, not having a single farmer in my own district, but I have done this believing it was for the best interests of the Nation. I have compiled the amount of money we have appropriated since 1932, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may include this statement in my remarks so that the Members from the rural sections of the country may have this information at hand to show their constituents how well we have done by them in the last 10 or 12 years.

Mr. COCHRAN and Mr. RICH rose.

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman tell us the total amount appropriated,

because otherwise we will not have the information until tomorrow?

Mr. SABATH. I will not only give the House the total amount appropriated but the appropriations by years:

In 1932, \$94,000,000—I will not mention the odd figures; in 1933, \$219,000,000; in 1934, when the Democrats came into power, we doubled that and made it \$538,000,000; in 1935, \$867,000,000; in 1936, \$652,000,000; in 1937, \$713,000,000; in 1938, \$697,000,000; in 1939, \$1,143,000,000; in 1940, \$1,149,000,000; or a total of over \$11,000,000,000.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I merely call your attention to the facts because of the complaints that are made from time to time that we are not providing sufficiently well in aid of the agricultural interests of this country.

The figures I have given must prove this administration's liberality toward agriculture and I hope the farmers will appreciate and recognize how liberal the Members of this House have been during the last five Congresses and how mindful they were of the interests of the agriculture of this country.

I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. In view of the gentleman's energetic interest in apprising the Nation of the money that has been given to the farmers, may I ask the gentleman if he has gone to the trouble of giving the House the figures on the amount of money that has been given to Japan in her time of trouble and to other foreign nations when they had certain catastrophes? Why does not the gentleman put those figures in the Record, or has the gentleman gone to that trouble?

Mr. SABATH. I will, if the gentleman cannot obtain the figures. I do not recollect that we have given Japan anything.

Mr. RIVERS. I am talking about the money that the American Government gave Japan when she had her earthquake. Does the gentleman recall that?

Mr. SABATH. Those amounts were negligible.

Mr. RIVERS. They were not negligible, and I will ask the gentleman if he would mind putting those into the Record.

Mr. SABATH. I will try to ascertain them, but the gentleman can obtain them as easily as I can for insertion in the Record.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is this an appropriation in aid of national defense?

Mr. SABATH. It is claimed it is for national defense.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just wanted to know; that is all.

Mr. SABATH. I know that after you gentlemen shall have listened to the appeals of the gentlemen representing the Committee on Agriculture and some of the gentlemen representing the stricken areas you will do as we did and vote in favor of the rule as well as the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman tell the House why the Committee on Agriculture picks out certain groups in certain areas, when, as I understand it, the heaviest rainfall in history occurred in the Missouri River Valley, the great corn valley in Missouri, wiping out the corn crop. I am not asking that you give the corn farmer or anyone else a dime, but I want to know, if you are going to give the cotton farmer and the tobacco farmer and the dairy farmer money, why you leave out wheat and corn farmers. I presume the reason is that if you put it in it would require a couple of hundred million dollars instead of \$20,000,000. So I ask why select the cotton farmer, the tobacco farmer, and the dairy farmer and leave out the wheat farmer and the corn farmer?

Mr. SABATH. I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and I have not voted for the bill in committee, neither have I prepared the bill, but we are bringing in a rule making this bill in order at the urgent request of that committee, which has heard evidence upon the need for this relief. I believe that the House has the right, I repeat, to vote upon what they claim is needed relief for the farmers in the stricken areas.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY. When the gentleman enumerates the sums that have been appropriated out of the United States Treasury in the name of the farmer, does not the gentleman think that in order to be fair he should also show that during this same time the farmer has received 50 percent less for his products than he did the 10 years before that?

Mr. SABATH. I would be only too pleased to put in the figures showing the present prices of agriculture, and the prevailing prices of agriculture during the years 1932 and 1933, and other years, but I do not want to be charged with trying in this instance to show the better conditions the farmer enjoys now than under the former administration, because some of you might think that I am trying to bring in politics, which I have been trying to avoid. I am merely directing attention to the annual appropriations for agriculture because this is a bill to aid agriculture, and I am not going into a wider field to call attention to other benefits that have accrued to the farmers and to other appropriations that have been made for the good of the country.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Is it not a fact that we already have in the Farm Security Administration, under the provisions for crop loans, a set-up which will take care of these cases of distress which are intended to be covered by this bill?

Mr. SABATH. I was under that impression, and I obtained information that I thought I should have and that the House should have as to whether the existing bureaus and administrations of the Department of Agriculture may have jurisdiction in this emergency drought-

relief situation. Among the various agencies that have been created to aid agriculture we have the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the Agricultural Marketing Service, the Bureau of Animal Industry—and I thought that might help in the New York case; then the Bureau of Dairy Industry, which would also apply to the New York needs; then there is the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Farm Credit Administration, the Farm Security Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Soil Conservation Service, the Surplus Marketing Administration, and the Office of the C. C. C. Activities, and one or two others. I was under the impression that many of these bureaus now in existence might have jurisdiction to relieve the stricken areas which this bill proposes to do.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for an observation?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. I come from a district which has suffered from drought during the last 10 years, and my reason for asking the question is that during that period our situation has been worse because it covers a longer period of time and nevertheless it has been adequately taken care of by the Farm Security Administration and the provision for crop loans and the Farm Credit Corporation, and I think that the situation which exists today can be very amply taken care of under these same agencies.

Mr. SABATH. That was my opinion, but unfortunately the gentlemen of the Committee on Agriculture, who are supposed to, and I do think, know more about these matters than I, seem to think differently.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. My recollection is that this matter was before the Committee on Rules several weeks ago, and at that time the committee was told by certain members of the Agricultural Committee that there was no merit in the bill, and that that committee itself, in a majority, was opposed to it and had not asked for a rule. Under that statement, the matter was left on the table of the Rules Committee. I was not at the meeting when the rule was voted out. Under those conditions, how did the bill get here? Did the Agricultural Committee ask for a rule?

Mr. SABATH. The original request to which the gentleman refers was on the bill H. R. 6120. The Rules Committee would not grant a rule because of differences existing and because the Agricultural Committee stated that they had agreed to some amendments that would call for less expenditure than the original bill. Consequently the Committee on Rules then suggested to the members of the Committee on Agriculture appearing before our committee that they had better rewrite the bill and eliminate all of the unnecessary and unlimited provisions for appropriations, and come in when they had agreed on a new bill, which would not be so far reaching. A

few weeks thereafter they brought in a bill, H. R. 6359, on which hearings were held, and that, by a nearly unanimous vote of the Committee on Rules, was reported favorably, and that rule is before us today.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman tell us the difference between the original bill and the bill reported out?

Mr. SABATH. The original bill, as I stated, was broad in its scope and had no limitation. This bill has a limitation and precludes any greater aid to any individual, whether he be a farmer, a tenant, or a sharecropper, than \$500, and only when it is shown that a crop failure exceeded 50 percent of normal production. That was not contained in the original bill.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. Referring to the limitations and changes that have been made in this bill since it was first reported to the Rules Committee, as referred to by my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], does this bill contain any limitation as to the total cost, as to how much money this may take out of the Federal Treasury?

Mr. SABATH. It will be taken out of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 5 of the bill. I have tried to ascertain the approximate cost and was informed by the chairman and members of the Committee on Agriculture that it would not reach more than \$10,000,000. Not that I questioned the statements of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture or its members, but I thought it best to find out whether they were within a reasonable figure and I have endeavored to obtain information from sources that ought to know, and I have been informed, although I could not get them on record, that the bill might cost close to \$20,000,000, instead of five or ten million.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. There has been some discussion of what limitations are placed on the receiving of help by virtue of this bill. Be it understood that nobody can receive any help whatsoever unless he made less than 40 percent of a normal crop. If it is unfair to help a person who made 40 percent of a normal crop, of course, to kill this bill is what you should do.

Mr. SABATH. That is correct. That is an additional restriction in the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I understand it, there is nothing in the bill that requires any showing of need on the part of either the landlord or the tenant, and even though there might be a restriction of \$500 on the part of the landlord, there still remains to be shown whether or not the landlord needs to receive \$500.

Mr. SABATH. I think that is partially provided for. I really do not know what other restrictions there may be other than those I have mentioned, but I

know that when the bill is taken up under the 5-minute rule the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will explain it to the gentleman and to the House.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I consumed?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 27 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. I feel that I have consumed much more time than I should have, so I will conclude as I have promised several Members some time to speak on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time, I believe, that the farmers of the East, particularly the dairy farmers of New York, have sought relief from the Congress and out of the Treasury of the United States. The farmers and dairy-men of the East have generally been paying the taxes and have not complained about the relief that has been afforded to the western and southern farmers, for these many years.

I might say at the outset of my remarks, although I come from a great dairy district, my district has not been affected by the drought and is not affected by this bill. Dairying in New York State is one of the largest and most important and one of the oldest industries of the State. In the northern part of our State, in the largest dairy sections, particularly in St. Lawrence County, there was a severe drought last summer. As a result the dairy farmers up there are not able to continue without financial aid or assistance from the Government. They do not have enough money to buy hay. Their farms are mortgaged and their credit is impaired. Like most dairy farmers with big investments in land and herds, they have eked out a precarious living and they have no accumulation of funds in the banks. So when the hay crops failed, those farmers, with their farms mortgaged, without credit, unable to buy hay at \$22 or \$24 a ton, are faced almost with extinction. Therefore we, their Representatives, come here pleading for the first time for immediate relief. I do not see why some Members of the Congress from western wheat and corn States get all excited about the dairy farmers obtaining Government aid, when they have been to the Congress for relief for years and have received it on a huge scale. Then, all of a sudden, when some dairy farmers up in the northern part of New York State are in bad financial difficulties, as a result of the failure of the hay crop, in the midst of a great emergency and war, when the administration is asking for more production of milk instead of less and when Government officials are demanding it, some western farm Representatives say, "We are not in sympathy with helping the farmers of the East."

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Is it not a fact, however, that the same methods of relief that have been used in the West, under

similar situations, are now available to the farmers of the East and the South?

Mr. FISH. I would rather let Members coming from those particular districts affected by the bill and members of the Committee on Agriculture answer that question. I have heard the matter discussed, but I am not a member of the committee, and I do not pose as an expert. I would rather let those who are answer that question in detail on the consideration of the bill. The gentleman also is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and will have ample opportunity to discuss or debate that issue. I am only talking on general principles and pleading for immediate relief for the dairy farmers in New York State for the first time in the Congress. I have no quarrel with the farm elements, either in the West or the South. I know something about the northern dairy sections of New York because only 2 years ago I served in St. Lawrence County in the northern Army maneuvers. I know about that dairy district, and certainly, although it is used primarily for dairying, it is not a rich country. The farms I observed there 2 years ago were run-down. The buildings on some of them did not have glass in the windows and most were without paint.

When dairy farmers suffer from an act of God, such as a drought, they have to sell their herds. The cattle is slaughtered, and that means limited production or a cessation of production of our important milk supply.

I am making a plea to you for the first time for consideration of the farmers of New York, and I know of no sound or legitimate reason why the farmers of New York should be discriminated against. I do not see why our own farmers, when they are affected by an act of God such as this, should not at least have the same relief we gave to Soviet Russia, or the same relief we gave to Japan, as we have in the past, or the same relief we gave to Chile, when the earthquake struck down there. We voted these foreign nations money when they suffered from acts of God. We should at least do the same in our own country. When hay cannot be grown, when crops fail, due to an act of God, we owe it to our own farmers to afford them relief.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I received a resolution this morning from the automobile people in Michigan asking for additional help. Does not the gentleman believe his farmers, for instance, are entitled to the same aid as the automobile people?

Mr. FISH. I do not want to get mixed up in the automobile problem. That is an entirely different situation. I do not know whether the automobile difficulty is due to an act of God or an act of the administration. The matter I am talking about is an act of God. I am saying to you that our oldest industry, that of supplying milk to New York City, is threatened, and the Government now is asking for more production. The State of New York unfortunately cannot help out in this situation. The Legislature of

the State of New York cannot vote this \$3,000,000 to provide transportation of hay and the baling of the hay for these farmers. It is against the constitution of the State of New York, and it would take 20 years to amend the constitution. In the next 3 months, unless there is relief, these cattle, some of the best herds in America, will be slaughtered.

These farmers have the right to be helped; and I am again saying to you, although this does not affect my district, that if this relief is not forthcoming there will be more and more abandoned farms, more and more ghost farms and ghost towns, up in the northern part of New York. They have not got the funds themselves; they have not got the credit. They cannot get it from the State of New York. Against their will, therefore, but by force of circumstances they have to come here to the Congress of the United States and ask the Congress in this emergency to afford them relief. All this bill does is to provide for the baling of hay and the transportation of the hay to the farmers, so that they can continue to produce milk at a time when the Government wants it. This is not asking very much, \$3,000,000, for the great State of New York, for the greatest farm industry we have in New York.

So we come here and humbly present our case to you. We have not complained about what the other farmers are getting in the way of aid in this emergency. We cannot help ourselves. We plead with you to give us some temporary relief so we can tide over and preserve the dairy industry in the northern part of the State of New York.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER].

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me aright this is the first time in 23 years I have ever stood in the Well of the House and made a request for financial aid for my own State. I feel constrained to do so now, because of the stern necessity that faces many of the dairy farmers in the northern and central parts of the State of New York.

My own individual territory suffered drought early in the season. We had no early hay crop, no early vegetable crop, but we had late rains which provided fall pasture and with the planting of sorghum, millet, and a late corn crop we had some slight advantage as regards cattle feeding. In the northern and central districts, however, they had to commence feeding as early as September and they soon found themselves running short of winter hay. To add to their problem Government agents were asking for a 5 percent added production of milk due to the war emergency. Auction sales are being held through the districts and dairymen are disposing of their cattle and depleting their dairy herds. This is a particularly dangerous situation at this time.

Another fact connected with this problem is that this area is in what might be described as a high-wage territory with large industrial and manufacturing plants; and the urge for these men to get rid of their herds and go and earn the re-

markable wartime wages that are now being distributed at this time is manifest. Our farmers, especially our dairy farmers in New York, have never been very great beneficiaries of the funds that were distributed under the A. A. A. plan because we raise none of the basic crops of wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, and so forth, to any great extent in New York State.

I think that the average farm aid given under the A. A. A. and the Soil Conservation Act has not been much over \$70 a farm during the last few years; so you can see that they have benefited very slightly by previous agricultural legislation.

When A. A. A. functions ceased due to a court decision and we adopted the Soil Conservation Act, that did not bring very much benefit, especially to the dairy farmer, because a dairy farmer is just naturally a soil conservationist. He has to be. There is no waste land on his property. He takes care of that with a sensible plan of crop rotation in order to provide feed for his animals. So that they have not been benefited at all by the Soil Conservation Act.

I hope that consideration will be given to the rather unusual necessity that faces the dairy farmers who are now being asked due to war necessity for an additional production of 5 percent. I attended the hearings, and some of them said they might be able to borrow the money, but I remember one witness who said there was an existing prejudice against borrowing money to buy feed. In this bill the Government is being asked to pay the freight charges on hay from Michigan and Ohio, where most of the hay will come from and the farmers will pay for the hay. I hope careful consideration will be given to this matter and aid extended to these dairy farmers, whose product is so vital a factor in our national economy.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am going to be so bold as to say that unless this bill is passed the dairy farmers of up-State New York will be in a situation not unlike the people of Egypt were at the end of the 7 years' famine in that ancient time. The only difference is that before the 7 years of famine in Egypt there were 7 years of plenty, and Joseph, by his foresight, had planned ahead so that he stored up in the granaries supplies for both the cattle and the people. Today, Mr. Chairman, we are affected by a condition which has been brought about by a combination of circumstances which started back in 1935, of flood, famine, drought, and nearly every other plague that could be suffered by agriculture. For this reason I am taking the floor at this time to appeal to the House to come to the rescue of thousands upon thousands of dairymen who operate their own farms either wholly by themselves or with part-time labor and who are advocating or asking for the opportunity to have their hay transported from distant points and that they be given the cost of transportation of this hay from places outside the area in which they live.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Has there been any survey made that the gentleman knows of showing the prospective decrease in the production of dairy products in this whole area in the next 18 to 24 months?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot give any figures to the gentleman, but I will say that unless there is some relief from the standpoint of bringing hay into the district, there will be a dearth of subsistence fodder such as will force the dairymen throughout the State of New York to dispose of their herds, which in turn will deprive the American people, particularly the people in the New York district, of the necessary amount of milk for national defense.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When the gentleman says that they will have to dispose of their herds, does he mean they will have to slaughter their herds?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. They will have to either slaughter their herds or sell them at a tremendous loss. It has taken from 5 to 7 years to build up these dairy herds, and this will mean a tremendous loss to those farmers if they are forced out of business. It will also be a loss to the American people if these dairy farmers are forced out of business.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In addition to your trouble from the standpoint of shortage of feed, is there any trouble in your area in connection with getting sufficient farm labor to maintain the production which has heretofore been carried on, even if you had the feed?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Even if we had the feed, there would be some trouble on account of shortage of farm labor; but notwithstanding that, if we were able to get the hay and feed we would be able to keep the dairy herds intact until such time as the forage season allowed them to go out to pasture and get sustenance from the field.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have been through a good part of the gentleman's district, and I know something about the farm conditions there. Has the gentleman reason to believe that we can, in the absence of new mechanical equipment and in the absence of a shortage of repairs for old equipment and shortage of farm labor that now faces us, maintain throughout the United States the production of foodstuffs during the next 2 years that we have the last 2 years?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. At the rate we are going today with dairymen and farmers in general going into bankruptcy because of the obstacles placed in their way from every source, I wish to express a serious doubt in my mind that we can maintain our production of foodstuffs unless we do plenty in the next few months to help the farmers.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN].

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the enactment of House bill 6359 as reported by the House Committee on Agriculture. This bill authorizes the Farm Security Administration to make grants to farmers to enable them to pay

the cost of baling and the cost of transportation of hay, grain, and other cattle feed into areas where the drought of 1941 has destroyed pastures and the hay crop.

One of the areas of the country that has been affected most adversely by the drought of 1941 is northern New York. Rainfall during the past year in New York State has been way below average. In June it was only 59 percent of average and in September 48 percent of average, and, in fact, the drought conditions in northern New York were far worse than they were in the rest of the State. As a consequence, the hay crop in New York State was over one and a half million tons below the average. In New York State we have available for each head of cattle about 2½ tons of hay, as compared with 3.2 tons in the previous year. In addition, pastures in northern New York were in a very bad condition because of the lack of rain, and as a consequence of the lack of hay it is going to be impossible in the drought-stricken areas to keep our herds together until the pastures are in a condition to be used once more.

In St. Lawrence County alone we will suffer from a lack of at least 39,000 tons of roughage that would be necessary to maintain our herds in minimum condition. The price of hay has been going up rapidly. On October 15 it was selling for \$16 a ton unbaled, as against \$7.20 a year before. Shipping in baled hay is costing considerably more than \$20 a ton.

The cost of farm labor in New York has gone up tremendously. Within a year it has risen almost 45 percent. In the face of these conditions our farmers in northern New York are right now breaking up fine dairy herds that it has taken years of painstaking work to build up.

We are increasing in tremendous proportions our shipments of all forms of dairy products to our Allies. Therefore it is imperative for national defense that the dairy herds of northern New York be kept in at least a minimum condition during the winter, so that they can be kept intact and produce the milk that is so vital for national defense. This bill, as you know, is limited to the present emergency.

When the Committee on Agriculture was considering this bill I appeared before them and said, in part:

I have talked with a great many dairy farmers in northern New York in the past 2 months, and they are desperately in need of hay and feed for their dairy herds due to the extreme drought which hit them the latter part of this past summer. The drought earlier in the summer was very bad, but the one later in the summer was by far the worst. The present price of milk does not allow them to pay \$20 a ton for hay and \$40 a ton for feed and break even. I believe that at least 25 percent, on the average, of the dairy herds in northern New York will be sold for beef, with the result that while probably New York City will still be able to get enough fluid milk, there will be practically no surplus for manufactured dairy products which are so vitally needed in our national defense program. As you know, the Secretary of Agriculture has urged, and even demanded, of the dairy farmers of the country an increase in production. This large and extremely important producing section, under present conditions, and if no help is given, will, in my opinion, of necessity face a decrease in production of from 25 to 30 percent.

In our national defense program we are spending millions to build munitions plants which will be a complete loss at the end of the war. If the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture is genuine, and I have no doubt it is, it seems to me just as necessary for the Government to spend some money under present conditions to get increased production of dairy products. From a national defense standpoint, I see no difference, really, between spending for a munitions plant and for increased dairy production.

In the light of these facts, I strongly urge the enactment of this legislation, and I hope the rule is adopted.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules in his perhaps unenthusiastic presentation of this rule brought out the fact that certain moneys had been received on account of parity payments and soil-conservation payments, running into a colossal sum.

May I say to the distinguished gentleman and the Members of the House who are present, on whom I must inflict myself briefly, that very little, if any, of that money went to the dairymen farmers of America. The dairymen farmers, who are the oldest type of farmers and who are performing a greater service to America in the way of providing food than any other type of farmer, have received a mere pittance from that great amount.

Here in this House today we have had the extraordinary spectacle of seeing certain gentlemen who have been the main beneficiaries of this program speak in opposition to this bill. They are fearful that their income from this source would be interfered with by the oncoming farmers from New York. They are solicitous; they are bitter. Their words in debate, as I might instance, are in some cases not quite up to a proper parliamentary standard.

Illustrating that point, I refer briefly to the district of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], a distinguished Member of the House, an ornament to the Congress. He is one of those who, forsaking his usual suave way, seems to have gotten in the saddle on this. I have no authority to say this, but I do not think the gentleman from Kansas is so much concerned about this pittance for the dairy farmers. I call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Rules to the fact that the district of the gentleman from Kansas in 1940 received from soil-conservation payments and parity payments \$17,251,000. My district during that year of our Lord, a dairying district, performing high service—higher service than even the gentleman's district in feeding the Nation—received approximately \$333,000 out of this great program.

Mr. Speaker, we come here hat in hand for the first time asking that our farmers be given not hay, for we buy the hay, but only the transportation cost of \$10 and the baling cost of \$3.50. All we ask is \$13.50 per ton. My farmers will go down in their lean purses and pay for the hay themselves. If they do not get this help, this mere pittance, they, whose forebears settled those farms 200 years ago, are

going to fade from the picture and become part of the unemployed in the cities. We are not begging for alms, we are asking you to provide the transportation and the baling. We will pay for the hay.

The legislation brought in by this rule includes benefits to New York State farmers. Thus, for the first time in his history the New York farmer appears in Washington in the role of a suppliant and asks for farm relief.

I realize that the average Member of the House visualizes New York State in terms of Wall Street. The fact is, however, that New York State stands sixth on the roll of farm States in the matter of production. We produced in 1941 approximately \$400,000,000 worth of agricultural products.

Last year a drought of extraordinary severity struck the northern part of the State. Hay crops fell off more than 75 percent in some areas. Few of the farmers in this area have sufficient hay to take their herds through the winter season which is long and severe with zero weather and deep snows prevailing.

In this bill the New York State farmers ask that the Government pay the cost of transportation and baling of the hay. The farmers themselves pay for the hay.

The item involved is about \$3,000,000. The whole bill does not carry more than \$10,000,000. The passage of the bill will salvage thousands of farmers north and south. We are spending \$100,000,000 to aid the suffering flax farmers in the Argentine. Let us do one-tenth as much for our own farmers by acting favorably on this rule and the accompanying bill.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] the balance of my time.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I noticed the flicker of a smile pass over many faces in this House when somebody asked if this is a national defense measure. If possible, I should like to have my colleagues consider this in a serious manner. I for one feel that we fail to recognize the situation this country is in. This Nation from its very beginning has never faced a crisis comparable to the one we face now. We are in a war, we are in a war to the death throughout the world, a war which, if it continues as long as many experts think it will, will draw upon the resources of this country in a way that is far in excess of anything of which we have ever dreamed.

I say to you without fear of contradiction from any man that the dairy business is a business of national defense. At this very moment your agricultural experts, working in conjunction with your Army and your Navy, are going into every school district and precinct of the country where the dairy industry exists urging that they produce at least 5 percent more than they are producing now.

The dairy industry is not general throughout the United States. As a business, it is located in certain sections both North and South. A large segment of this national defense industry happens to be in four or five counties in northern New York, in the mountainous section where ordinarily there is an

abundance of rainfall, fine pastures, plenty of hay, and plenty of ensilage of all kinds; but last year four or five counties in northern New York became practically a desert. Streams dried up. Farmers had to drive for miles and miles to find sufficient water to haul to their cattle to keep them alive.

Dairy industries are not built overnight. It takes years to build up tested and productive herds. The dairymen must have silos, expensive machinery, and careful inspection to comply with the health laws.

With your indulgence, I propose to carry this through in my reasoning to its logical conclusion. When I shall have finished I expect that every Member who believes in national defense will vote for this rule. I have no fear of the result in the House if this bill can be properly debated.

The farmers of this Nation furnished more than one-fourth of the fighting men in World War No. 1. Not only this, the farmers were expected to, and they did, do their work with the aid of school boys and girls and unskilled laborers. Yet the farmers never flinched when called upon to produce to the limit to feed the armed forces here and abroad and also to feed the civilian population here and abroad.

The Government officials are now asking the farmers throughout the Nation to produce, and among this farm group the dairymen are being urged to increase the production of butter, cheese, and milk. At no time in our history has it been more urgent that the dairy industry be geared to high production to meet the present and the future requirements of this world-wide war. There is one thing sure, and that is this: The farmers of the United States will do their full share in winning this war. They will furnish sons for the armed forces. They will carry on as they did in 1917 and 1918. They will do this under a heavy handicap. Labor will be drawn from the farm to defense industries to take advantage of wages, in some instances as high as \$20 a day in the Mohawk Valley—Utica, Rome, Sidney. There will be no amortization hand-outs to the dairy farmers. There will be long, grueling labor for them in an effort to meet the demand of their Government.

The 1941 drought in four counties in New York:

The hay crop was a failure. Ensilage and other feed crops did not mature. Unless feed can be shipped into this dairy area, the dairy cattle, numbering 219,906, will have to be sold.

The 13,997 farms in the 4 counties involved are not adapted to any other type of farm production.

It is important to national defense that this large segment of the dairy industry be protected and preserved until the cattle can be pastured this spring.

These dairy farmers have been hard hit for several years, and now when they were about to see the light of day the drought of 1941 destroyed the hay necessary to winter the herds.

The importance of food production cannot be stressed too strongly. To illustrate the point, the Chicago Quartermaster Depot is shopping for 1,500,000 men and spending \$5,000,000 a month for victuals.

Why are the dairymen being urged to increase production of cheese, butter, and milk? The first reason is that this country is at war. We are not only the arsenal of the so-called democracies but we are becoming more and more the food supply of the so-called democracies. We are sending our armed forces abroad, and they must be fed by us because there is a shortage of food in the countries to which our soldiers are being sent. The demand for food is tremendous and time cannot be wasted in its production.

Now, why are dairy products so essential during war? Let us analyze the question. Scientific research has demonstrated that ordinary market beef has about five times as much food value per pound as average cows' milk. A choice 2-year-old beef steer will yield, including all edible portions, as high as 65 percent of its live weight in meat, or about 650 pounds. Accordingly it would require approximately 3,250 pounds—650 times 5—of milk to yield an amount of human food equivalent to that which required 2 years to grow in the form of beef. There can be no time lost in preparing to feed an American army of eight to ten million men. Every acre of land must be utilized to the best advantage to produce food for such an army.

Here are the facts as to why the Government is urging dairymen to produce more—a fifth more, if possible: Data compiled by the United States Department of Agriculture show that the average annual yield of milk per cow in the principal American dairy States is about 4,500 pounds. It is further shown by the Department of Agriculture that an acre of land will produce about four times as much digestible protein and about five and one-half times as many calories of fuel if it is devoted to milk production as it would if devoted to the growing of beef. Another authority says:

It is a very conservative statement to assert that, under the very best possible conditions of production with both classes of animals, the cow is more than twice as economical in her use of food energy, when we consider the output for human uses, than is the steer or sheep.

Mr. Speaker, soon mutton will have to be sacrificed to the production of wool, of which we are told there is a shortage. This war will require all the beef, all the dairy products, to meet the food demand of the world. Why destroy the dairy industry in northern New York? I repeat that the dairy industry is absolutely essential to national defense.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] such time as he may care to use.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is vitally important. It is important to the health and almost to the very life of hundreds of our farmers in Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas. It is the difference between continuing these people on their little farms and that of throwing them off of the farms and on the charity of their fellowman. Already hundreds of thousands of our people have been displaced from their normal occupations by the national defense program. Do not add to this displacement. This rule

should be voted and this bill discussed on its merits.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks which I have made today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I hope that if I stay here long enough I may justify the reputation of never appearing in the well of the House without having a little something to say. My purpose in rising now is to dissipate the impression that we are asking for the approval of a rule that will establish a precedent for Federal relief. As a matter of fact, the Congress of the United States has always responded and come to the relief of people in this country where the local facilities were unable to furnish the necessary relief. That is, our Government has not only been quite generous in providing aid or assistance to prevent suffering of our own people who have sustained great losses from natural causes or circumstances over which they have no control, but such aid has been accorded to sufferers in other countries; and the principle involved in the bill to be considered should this rule be adopted is not new. It will not establish a precedent as claimed by those objecting to this rule. If, by its adoption, it established a new governmental policy or a precedent, I would not be here urging the approval of this rule and the passage of the bill; but this is not a new policy, nor is it a new idea, nor does it establish a precedent.

I have examined the records and find that since 1803, up until the present day, the Congress has from time to time enacted legislation appropriating money to lend or make grants to people where they have suffered losses due to conditions over which they had no control, like storms, floods, fires, insect pests, hurricanes, earthquakes, droughts, and so forth.

As far back as 1803 Congress provided for relief of sufferers from the Portsmouth fire by extending the time for discharging customhouse bonds, a similar act for similar purposes being passed in 1804 for the benefit of sufferers from the fire at Norfolk.

In 1812, \$50,000 was appropriated for the benefit of those who suffered from an earthquake in Venezuela.

An act providing for direct relief for landowners in New Madrid County, Missouri Territory, who suffered losses on account of an earthquake, was passed in 1815. Here the Government actually gave farmers new farms in the place of those destroyed as a result of the earthquake. I wonder if the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], who is opposing this rule now recalls how generous

our Government was toward the people of his great State when they were in need on account of a disaster over which they had no control.

In 1836 Congress made an appropriation for aiding those who had sustained losses from Indian depredations in Florida. Another appropriation of \$200,000 was made in 1863 for the relief of persons injured or suffering losses from Indian depredations in Minnesota.

Relief was provided for sufferers from the fire at Portland, Maine, in 1866.

An act providing for the use of naval vessels for transportation of supplies contributed for relief of destitute persons in France and Germany was passed in 1871.

An appropriation of \$190,000 was provided in 1874 for the relief of sufferers on account of the overflow of the Mississippi River and its tributaries. Another appropriation amounting to \$300,000 for the same purpose in 1882, and another for \$500,000 in 1884.

In 1875 an appropriation of \$180,000 was made for the benefit of farmers who suffered from grasshopper ravages. Since then acts for similar purposes have been passed from time to time.

In 1890 Congress passed an act appropriating \$175,000 and providing for 2,500 tents for use by sufferers in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

An appropriation was made in 1890 to assist farmers who suffered from drought in the Territory of Oklahoma.

In 1897 there was an appropriation of \$200,000 to assist farmers suffering from overflow of the Red River of the North and tributaries of the Mississippi River. An appropriation of \$50,000 the same year was provided to assist the destitute citizens of the United States in Cuba and for their transportation home. Another appropriation was made the same year providing assistance to sufferers from the overflow of the Rio Grande.

In 1902 an appropriation of \$100,000 for the benefit of the destitute inhabitants of Cuba was made, together with an appropriation of \$200,000 to assist sufferers from earthquakes in the French West Indies.

An appropriation of \$800,000 for the benefit of a destitute people suffering on account of the Messina earthquake in Italy was provided in 1909.

In 1912 an appropriation of \$1,239,000 for the benefit of those who suffered from floods in the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys.

In 1913 approximately \$1,000,000 were appropriated for the benefit of persons who suffered from floods in Ohio, Indiana, Alabama, Mississippi, and other Midwestern States.

Upward of \$200,000 were appropriated in 1914 for the relief of sufferers on account of the fire at Salem, Mass. There was also an appropriation in the same year to the extent of \$540,000 for the relief of flood sufferers in a number of Southern States.

Relief was furnished to persons suffering from overflow of the Arkansas River and tributaries in Colorado in 1921. Provision was made the same year for expenditure of \$20,000,000 from funds of the United States Grain Corporation for the benefit of people in Russia with

\$4,000,000 additional to American associations for relief.

In 1925 upward of \$6,000,000 was provided for earthquake sufferers in Japan.

In 1927 \$253,000 was made available to farmers for losses sustained in the way of crops and livestock by the Florida hurricane.

Approximately \$10,000,000 was provided in 1928 to rehabilitate agriculture in Puerto Rico following the hurricane of September 1928. An appropriation of \$6,000,000 was authorized to aid farmers in the Southeastern States who suffered loss of crops on account of the same hurricane.

An appropriation of \$45,000,000 was authorized in 1930 for the benefit of farmers who suffered on account of the drought and storms in the United States, \$20,000,000 of which were appropriated within less than 30 days following the passage of the authorization.

I could give record of about 150 acts or resolutions providing assistance to sufferers from the causes already mentioned, but I think we have given enough references to show that the request now before this committee is not without precedent. I certainly trust the rule will be adopted, and if it is, I shall then endeavor to present facts sufficient to justify favorable consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief excerpt from an article by Mr. Ernest K. Lindley on the Pearl Harbor disaster.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Wisconsin State Journal, of Madison, Wis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

RELIEF FOR CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS IN STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6359) granting relief to certain agricultural producers in stricken areas who suffered crop failures in 1941 because of adverse weather conditions, insect pests, or other uncontrollable natural causes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House

on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6359, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this bill (H. R. 6359) seeks to give relief to the needy farmers whose crops last year were practically destroyed by boll weevil infestation and unfavorable weather conditions.

The bill is very simple. Under one section it seeks to help the cotton farmer whose 1941 cotton production was less than 40 percent of the normal production of his cotton acreage allotment. He may be paid parity between the difference that he produced and 40 percent of a normal crop.

I introduced a bill similar to the one now under consideration which would allot the cotton producer a grant between what he produced and 50 percent of a normal production. Several bills were introduced along this line and the committee reduced this amount from 50 to 40 percent of normal production.

To illustrate under the bill now being considered, suppose a farmer's normal production on his allotted acreage was 2,000 pounds of cotton. Last year the weevil destroyed all except 400 pounds. Under this bill the farmer would receive parity for the 400 pounds which represents the difference between what he actually produced and 40 percent of his normal crop.

Many counties in Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas had almost a total crop failure due to infestation of the boll weevil and unfavorable weather conditions. A number of the counties in my district produced less than 20 percent of a normal cotton crop, and eight or nine counties made less than 10 percent of a normal cotton crop. Cotton is the only money crop in my district, and many counties in the district produced no corn, grain, or food crop on account of the long drought in the spring, followed by nearly 3 months of wet weather. This condition has never existed before in my district or many other sections of the South. In the early fall I visited every county in my district and saw the crops in many of the fields. Acres and acres planted to cotton did not produce anything.

In addition to the total failure in many sections, the cost of production was more last year than any previous year on account of the rising prices of everything, together with additional taxes. The crops of many farmers last year will not pay for the fertilizer, and I just cannot see how many of these farmers can go through the winter without some aid. They have no grain or food for the winter months nor money with which to buy clothing and shoes. They are without credit and their neighbors are not in position to aid them. These people desire to remain on the farm and they must have something to exist on.

Besides, from a national defense viewpoint it is necessary that they produce

food and cotton to assist in winning this war. The policy of the Government now is to encourage farmers to produce food and feed necessary for defense.

The hearings before the Agricultural Committee and the census reports show the plight of the cotton farmer just as I have stated. I submitted from the Census Bureau, Department of Commerce, a preliminary report of cotton ginned prior to November 1, 1941, comparing the production of 1940 and 1941 in the 17 counties of my district. As I have just stated, this report shows that many of the counties produced less than 10 percent of a normal crop.

There would be no necessity for any legislation to assist these farmers now had the crop-insurance law been passed earlier. Someone may say that this is a bad precedent, but we have had the precedent before. However, there will be no necessity from now on to make grants to any commodity producers as we have the crop-insurance law now on the statute books. We passed an insurance bill some 2 years ago, but that bill was vetoed.

I do not see how anyone can oppose this bill to aid the farmers who, through no fault of theirs, are absolutely helpless. The object of this bill is to help this class in needy circumstances. No one, regardless of the amount produced in normal crop years, may obtain more than \$500.

I understand there is a bill pending to aid people who will be out of employment on account of changing the industries of the country to making implements of war. These industries are located in cities, and large cities. Certainly no one who feels this class should be aided can vote against this bill to help farmers who cannot exist without aid and also will be unable to produce food and clothing for national defense.

As fully stated in the committee's report, I desire to stress that these farmers are unable to pay any of their obligations unless relief is granted. Many of them will leave the farms, bringing about foreclosures on both real and personal property, which means serious losses to the farmers, the Government agencies, and all creditors of these farmers.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, war is inflammatory; it produces tongues of flame that sear the soul of man; it sweeps us along on a fiery wave of excitement; we lose our sense of proportion in the thrill and the chill of the immediate horror; we draw from our resources as we would draw water from the fire hose; we know we must put out that fire—the fire of war. We are willing to pay any price to do it; we want to do it now. We want an army, we want a navy, we want a marine corps, we want an air force—now. Yes, yes, we will pay, but we want these things now. The fire is spreading, we must put it out. We want tanks, we want planes, we want ships, we want guns, we want bullets for the guns, we want bombs, we want space, we want speed—now, now, now, not tomorrow, now. The fire is spreading, the

stream of water must play on it continuously, now. Sure, we will pay for it, pay for it now, whatever it cost, anything to stop the fire. That is because we see the flame, we hear it snap and crackle, we feel the sting and burn of it. It burns our eyes, it roars in our heads, the smoke of it chokes us, we must stop it now, what matter the cost in dollars, get the water, put out the fire, pay for it, pay for it, keep that water flowing on that fire until the last feeble spark dies out.

But the water will not flow through that hose if the spring is clogged up or if the spring runs dry. The spring that supplies the water that runs through that hose is the American farmer. Back of the tanks, the planes, the ships, the guns, the bullets, the bombs, is the agricultural army. Back of the men and women who produce the tanks, the planes, the ships, the guns, the bullets, the bombs, is the patient loyal, self-sacrificing patriotic agricultural army. They supply food. Our fighting forces must be fed; our industrial army must be fed; our civilians must be fed; the American farmer must supply the food.

Modes of transportation, means of operation, may change but our Army still moves on its stomach. Food, food, food; that is a first must, whether our Army moves on the land, in the sea, under the sea, or in the Army, the man who keeps him moving, the man who keeps him equipped, the man who sustains him wherever he may be—that man is the American farmer. Without him no machinery turns over; without him no soldiers are clothed; without him no soldiers have guns; without him we build no ships; without him we have no planes, no bullets, no army marching, no planes flying; but are we willing to pay him? A farmer harvests wheat in Kansas and that wheat makes planes in California. Fruit juices grown by farmers in California, Texas, Florida, turn on power juices in our industrial centers. Corn shelled in Iowa sends shells to Hawaii. Are we going to pay him now? We know we cannot afford to strangle him with inadequate pay. We cannot afford to have anything happen to that free flow of water now. It is one thing for a ship to be launched 10 months from now, but 10 minutes is too long to delay the American industrial army's breakfast, now. The man who needs the most encouragement, the highest morale now, is the man who will uphold the morale of the Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, the industrial army, the civilian army. For the duration, that man is the American farmer. Food is, always has been, always will be a must, a first must. Without it you have no morale. No piece of equipment, no branch of our service is as strategic, as critical as food. Important as our industrial army is to every branch of our service, remember it only starts moving after breakfast. Our American agricultural army is a must now, not tomorrow, not next week, not next month, but now, and tomorrow and next week and next month, and next year—yes, for the duration.

Our agricultural army must not be slighted, not left by the wayside, not

abandoned to carry on alone in our feverish excitement; they must remain intact, they must be paid now. Let anything happen to that spring and we can not put out the fire. Keep that spring flowing by keeping the American farmer going. Pay him, pay him now. He does not ask the unreasonable, but he deserves the best. The peace, the security, the freedom of 130,000,000 people depend upon him, now. Give him what he deserves. He will not ask for more, he should not have less. We can have food without bullets but we cannot have bullets without bread.

Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to support this rule and H. R. 6359, for which the rule is asked.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, we are considering a bill to relieve certain agricultural producers in stricken areas who suffered crop failures in 1941 because of too much rain, not enough rain, insect pests, or other uncontrollable natural causes. This bill has been carefully studied for many weeks by the Committee on Agriculture. I wish to say here that the bill is not as strong and does not go as far as I would like, but the Committee on Agriculture feels that it is the best bill which it can agree on at this time. I wish to express my personal appreciation to the Committee on Agriculture and to its very able and conscientious chairman for the time and effort spent on this legislation. They first presented a bill a few weeks ago which went further than this bill goes, but circumstances forced the committee to modify their first bill. It was estimated that the first bill presented would have cost approximately \$40,000,000, but it is now estimated that the present bill will not cost over ten or fifteen million dollars.

I wish to point out that the modified bill presented by the committee deals only with the question of need and is presented here purely as an emergency proposition. It is an effort to relieve to some extent farmers in areas which were the worst stricken by crop failures. A large part of northwest Louisiana, east Texas, a portion of South Arkansas, most of South Carolina, a part of Georgia and Alabama, and a large section of New York have been hit the worst by crop failures in 1941.

The very wording of the bill so limits it in scope that I can hardly see how anyone can conscientiously oppose it. No one should object to a stricken farmer having the necessities of life. The farmer is the poorest paid man in the whole country. This bill does not set a precedent, as has been argued here this evening. But, even if it did, it is certainly not the first time that Congress has set a precedent. In these emergency times Congress has set one precedent right after another. A few years ago Massachusetts and the New England States had a storm that was very devastating, and we went along with an appropriation to help. We have been glad to go along with other areas that had visited upon them unusual occurrences

resulting in great loss of property. If it rains every day for 60 or 70 days, crops are destroyed, as much so as if we had had a cloudburst and tornado all happening at one time. In 1940 our farmers produced only about half a crop of cotton, and in 1941 the rains reduced our production to less than 20 percent in some sections. In fact, some farmers produced hardly enough cotton to justify the picking. The rains were so bad that in many places it was difficult, if not impossible, to produce vegetables in the garden.

Mr. Chairman, in the short time allotted to me, I have undertaken to show the urgency of this matter. I wish for a moment now to direct your attention to the fact that this is a national-defense project. I have loyally voted for every gun, every airplane, every tank, every ship, and every other defense weapon which the President has requested. I have voted the vast sums for the lend-lease bills. I would not for one moment question the importance of all of these things. We need more of them. But I know that armies cannot fight without food and clothing. The man between the plow handles is necessary to victory. They tell us that America must be not only the arsenal of the Allies but that it must be the granary as well. We are expected to produce food and other articles necessary for national defense. These farmers who have been so sorely stricken need this additional help to enable them to contribute more fully to national defense. I can assure you of their loyalty and patriotism, and I know that they are willing to produce to the utmost. It is vital to national defense that they be encouraged and be helped to produce a bountiful crop in 1942.

I will say briefly, that this money is coming largely from the parity money that has already been provided for.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I am sorry. The gentleman knows my time is very limited.

We have the money provided for in the parity funds. We are not going to be able to use that money this year, because the price of cotton is around the parity price. Therefore, we are simply asking this Congress now to give us a small part of that.

I urge that this is an unusual situation. It is not a general situation. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has attempted to bring out several times the fact that the farm security program provides for these things. The Farm Security Administration has undertaken and will undertake to provide for the ordinary things, the ordinary farm situations; but we are facing an extraordinary situation. Gentlemen, we ask you to help us bring relief to these stricken farmers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 16]

Allen, Ill.	Hébert	Rabaut
Andresen,	Hendricks	Ramspeck
August H.	Hinshaw	Rees, Kans.
Andrews	Holbrook	Robinson, Utah
Boehne	Hook	Romjue
Boggs	Jensen	Sacks
Boykin	Johnson,	Schaefer, Ill.
Bradley, Pa.	Lyndon B.	Scott
Buck	Johnson, W. Va.	Shanley
Burgin	Kee	Simpson
Carlson	Kefauver	Smith, Pa.
Celler	Kirwan	Somers, N. Y.
Clark	Kopplemann	Sparkman
Cluett	Kramer	Stearns, N. H.
Crowther	Lambertson	Stratton
Dewey	Landis	Sweeney
Ellis	Larrabee	Thomas, N. J.
Elston	McGranery	Thomas, Tex.
Fenton	Magnuson	Vincent, Ky.
Fannagan	Mitchell	Vreeland
Ford	Monroney	Ward
Leland M.	Myers, Pa.	Wene
Ford,	Nelson	Whelchel
Thomas F.	Nichols	White
Gavagan	O'Day	Winter
Gifford	O'Hara	Worley
Gossett	Osmer	Youngdahl
Haines	Pierce	
Harness	Powers	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6359) granting relief to certain agricultural producers in stricken areas who suffered crop failures in 1941 because of adverse weather conditions, insect pests, or other uncontrolled natural causes, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 349 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its session.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill so far during the debate has been classified as a relief measure, and comparisons have been made with the situation that existed in New England a few years ago by reason of a tornado. It has been compared to the situation that exists following an earthquake, or other such disaster, but such is not the case. Need is not made a prerequisite to obtain relief under this bill. I believe if anyone is interested enough to want to try to find out really what the bill attempts to do will find it amounts simply to being a new precedent, a new scheme where as the course of events move along and you have a partial crop failure in any community in the country the Congress is to step in and provide insurance against such crop failure.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I am sorry, I cannot yield. I have but 5 minutes.

Let us look at the bill and see what is the real intent and purpose back of this thing. I realize that the gentlemen from New York who spoke under the rule stated what is the fact, that they have not been in the well of this House very often asking anything for the farm sections of their State; but I say to these

gentlemen that in my humble opinion this bill will not do anything for New York. I say that if a New York farmer has to qualify as provided under the terms of the bill through the Farm Security Administration he will not have any relief under this measure; and I base this statement upon testimony that was given before the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I am sorry, I have not time to yield.

The bill now before us is not the original bill introduced in the committee. But testimony was had on the bill in the committee; farmers from New York, witnesses before the committee, were asked if they were willing to be governed by the requirements of the Farm Security Administration in order to obtain the benefits, and they stated emphatically no, that if that went into the bill it would not give them any relief whatever.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma declines to yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. As the bill was finally reported from the committee these other provisions were written into it. Let us look at some of the language of the bill, let us turn to the provision which would apply to the farmers of New York. I will read it and then I would like to have some Member from the State of New York tell me what it means:

SEC. 3. In the case of any area with respect to which the Secretary of Agriculture determines (a) that by reason of drought in 1941 the condition of pastures or the production of hay and other forage crops used in such area to sustain dairy cows is such as to threaten to result in a substantial reduction in the production of milk in such area or to result in the reduction by dairy farmers in such area of their foundation herds, and (b) that milk and other dairy products produced in such area are required for the purposes of "An act to promote the defense of the United States," or needed for other defense purposes.

To what act to promote the defense of the United States does this refer? What must the Secretary of Agriculture find when he undertakes to assist in classifying those eligible to participate hereunder?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in this Chamber in my desire to aid and assist the distressed farmers of this country. No one in this Chamber has lived in a community where continued crop failures existed for as great a length of time as in the Panhandle sections of Oklahoma, Texas, eastern New Mexico, Colorado, and western Kansas, but our farmers did not ask for or obtain special relief in grants and doles as contemplated by this legislation. They looked to and relied upon the regular agencies of the Department of Agriculture for their assistance. All of these same agencies are available to the affected districts in the cotton areas represented here this afternoon. We should not establish the precedent called for in this proposed bill.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the position taken by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] who preceded me and vigorously opposed the passage of this bill. I am wondering whether or not he is familiar with Statute No. 26-679-44, enacted by Congress on September 1, 1890, in which an appropriation was made for the relief of farmers in the Territory of Oklahoma because they had suffered from an unprecedented drought.

In my remarks earlier in the day in support of the rule providing for the consideration of this bill I referred to a number of acts of Congress making grants or ratifying grants for relief to sufferers from floods, fires, earthquakes, storms, droughts, insect infestation, and so forth. I stated there were upward of 150 such acts dating back as far as 1803 and as late as 1939. As I referred to a number of them specifically I do not think it necessary at this time to refer to more than a very few and I am doing this for the reason that some of the opponents of the bill are arguing that it is establishing a precedent, saying that the Federal Government has never heretofore made grants but only loans for relief to any sufferer.

I call attention to an act of Congress February 17, 1815, following an earthquake in what is now the State of Missouri. This act provided that where lands had been destroyed or injured as a result of this earthquake a farmer would be given another farm from public lands without requiring him to qualify under the homestead law. In 1866 Congress passed an act admitting free of duty any foreign contributions for relief of sufferers from a fire at Portland, Maine. The same act suspended the collection of internal-revenue duties from those who suffered losses from this fire. In 1874 an appropriation was made for the purchase of food and clothing and given to people who suffered losses on account of the overflow of the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. Other legislation was later enacted in which such sufferers were furnished furniture, bedding, clothing, and so forth, all of which were direct grants. As far back as 1875 Congress appropriated \$30,000 to purchase and donate seed to farmers who had lost their crops from grasshopper ravages. This was a direct grant and not a loan. Yes; the Congress went further than that, it appropriated \$150,000 to be used in the purchase of food and clothing to be given to the same farmers. In 1884 an appropriation of \$300,000 was made for the purchase and distribution of food, clothing, and so forth, to people who suffered losses on account of the overflow of the Ohio River and its tributaries. This was a direct grant. I could give a hundred or more of similar references, but anyone familiar with the facts will not undertake to say this is the establishment of a precedent in principle.

Objection has been made to the provision of the bill that would aid some

dairy farmers in New York State where they lost their crops on account of drought, such aid to be limited to the freight on hay or cattle feed. The objectors say that assistance in the way of furnishing transportation by the Government to individuals is without precedent. I am sure no one familiar with the facts could justify such a statement, because in 1867, 1868, and 1871, following the War between the States, when there was much suffering among the newly freed slaves, Congress enacted legislation providing appropriations for use in making grants in the way of food, clothing, furniture, and so forth, and the legislation further provided for the payment of freight or transportation charges on all contributions for the relief of these people, as well as contributions sent to destitute persons in France and Germany. In 1880 Congress made an appropriation to be used for the chartering of ships for transportation of contributions for relief to famishing people of Ireland and other points. A ship was chartered by the Secretary of the Navy to carry a shipload of supplies from New York to Wilmington, N. C., to be distributed among the colored people of that State. Certainly there is no precedent established by the provisions in this bill.

I am not unmindful that legislation of this kind must necessarily be based upon proof showing more than a local disaster and there must be suffering and need as a result therefrom. I would be opposed to legislation if only a few people were involved, because it would then be the obligation of the community, county, or State, but here there are thousands of people who are suffering as a result of a disaster, and I feel it is within the province of the Federal Government to come to their assistance somewhat in proportion to their need and losses. I am not personally familiar with the total area involved, but what I have to say is based upon personal knowledge and facts that cannot be denied. I shall use the circumstances in my home county as an illustration in support of my argument.

The record will show that from about the 12th of June of last year up to and shortly after August 1 we had about 22 inches of rainfall, making it impossible for many farmers to get into some of their fields for a period of 2 months, and as a consequence, many lost their entire cotton crop and a great portion of their corn. According to the last census, there were a little over 2,000 farmers in Saluda County, S. C., and I hold in my hand affidavits from 1,485 of these farmers showing their production of cotton in 1940 and 1941. I have tabulated the information contained in these affidavits and find that 10 percent of them did not pick 1 pound of cotton this last year, and 36 percent produced less than one-half of a bale, the average being less than 2 bales, when the year previous the average was between 7 and 8 bales. Their yield of corn was somewhat in proportion.

Anyone familiar with farming operations—it matters not whether you are

from South Carolina, Texas, California, Nebraska, Maine, or New York—will know that where there is such a crop failure there is certain to be distressing need. Many have written me and said they have no cash income whatsoever, and in many instances were unable to secure meat, bread, or clothing for their families. They have certainly had a disaster, and a great many of them are in need. According to the evidence submitted, a similar situation exists in a majority of the counties in my State as well as a number of counties in other States.

Some who are opposing this bill say they admit the facts but suggest that these people should go to the W. P. A. for relief. It may be that in a few instances some may find employment but in most localities in my district there are no W. P. A. projects to go to. Furthermore, I would like to suggest that from my observation and experience a man who undertakes to make a living on a farm has work to do every month, every week, and every day of the year, and if he is required to go to the W. P. A. for the next 2 or 3 months he will have made no preparation for his recovery next year. I submit further it will be cheaper for the Government to make the grants herein proposed than to provide additional funds for W. P. A. projects. Furthermore, when he is doing W. P. A. work he will not be contributing very much toward the defense program, whereas, if he is at home getting ready for spring planting he may be making a very valuable contribution to our defense program this next year.

I suggest further there are no Federal W. P. A. projects in that section of the country and the Federal Government would obtain no benefit from such an expenditure, but these men are farmers and agriculture is the basis of our national wealth and if they can remain on the farm and continue their operations they will contribute to our national wealth, which will be a partial security for the enormous sums of money we are now appropriating to defend our Government and its institutions. These people are without subsistence, and if they are forced to go elsewhere to find employment in order to keep soul and body together then agriculture to that extent must suffer and this is a time when agriculture is going to rank second to none in our elements of defense. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] when he stated a short while ago there will be a break-down in our defense program from the standpoint of agricultural production within a period of 1 year unless we are able to maintain and retain labor on our farms. In my section a number of farms have already been deserted for the reason that the occupants had nothing upon which to subsist, and for the further reason that the Government is offering fabulous prices—prices too fabulous—for work on some of its defense activities. I do not blame these people at all—if I were in their place I would go too—but the point I am trying to make is that many of them are leaving reluctantly, and if the Government would only come to their

assistance for a few months they would remain and contribute toward the production of those crops so essential in our defense program. It will be a tragedy if we fail in our production program.

Others have suggested that these farmers should go to the Farm Security Administration for aid. My reply is that some have called upon this agency for assistance. I wish I had time to review the correspondence with the men and women who say they have been going to the office of the Farm Security Administration for the past 2 or 3 months and so far, they tell me, they have not been able to get an opinion on their application.

You understand I am not availing myself of the opportunity to criticize the Farm Security administration but it seems that its programs and regulations do not fit in and take care of this situation. Under the provisions of the Farm Security Act providing aid or grants to farmers when crops have been destroyed by hail, floods, storms, or otherwise a representative of the Department makes an investigation to determine whether the applicant is in need of assistance and then decide upon the amount that may be granted. This bill duplicates the existing law providing that the Secretary of Agriculture, and he can elect to do this through the Farm Security Administration if he sees fit, shall first determine who is entitled to aid under existing regulations but instead of leaving the amount of aid to be granted within the discretion of an individual this bill provides a yardstick to be used in fixing the maximum amount of each grant and in doing this it undertakes to distribute the aid as near as mathematically possible to the need and losses sustained. Under the Farm Security Act the amount of the loan or grant is within the discretion of the inspector and the sky may be the limit, but under the formula of this bill no person would receive a grant in excess of \$500 and it could not exceed, in the case of cotton, the difference of what he produced this year and 40 percent of his normal production multiplied by the parity price fixed by the Department of Agriculture. To illustrate: If a farmer's normal production, as previously ascertained by the Department of Agriculture, should be 300 pounds per acre, he would first deduct 60 percent, which would leave 120 pounds, and if it were shown that the farmer produced 90 pounds of cotton per acre this year he would be paid on the difference between 90 and 120 or 30 pounds at the rate of approximately 16.5 cents per pound, which would give him \$4.95 per acre, and if he had 10 acres, he would get \$49.50. This is not a great amount but it would enable that farmer to stay at home and try to get ready for another crop.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, up until the Christmas holidays a number told me they had not been able to get an application approved by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. If they have not been able to get an application approved since last September by the Farm Security Administration, how does the gentleman expect them to get an application approved under this bill, when it must be approved in order to get it?

Mr. FULMER. May I answer the gentleman's question? I will yield you additional time.

Mr. HARE. Yes; with that understanding.

Mr. FULMER. This bill is administered by the Secretary of Agriculture. They do not have to go to the Farm Security Administration. The Farm Security rules and regulations governing grants provide that a man cannot receive relief unless he is actually in need. Reference is made to the Farm Security Administration. My committee—and, in connection with that, there was my good friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]—wanted to investigate the Farm Security Administration for what they are doing. He is on the committee. They are spending millions and giving grants, but they are not touching the real proposition that they ought to do.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman indicate who is supporting these people and who have been doing so since last August?

Mr. HARE. Their neighbors and what little work they are able to pick up in the community.

Mr. KEEFE. Do not the municipalities take care of these people?

Mr. HARE. No. We have no municipalities of any size. There is not a municipality in my county with as many as two thousand people in it, but there are 20,000 people in the county dependent upon cotton and corn for a living, and they have not made any, because, as I have already said, they had 22 inches of rainfall within a period of slightly more than 60 days.

Mr. Chairman, under the policy of the Government, as I said a few minutes ago, from 1803 up until the present hour, we have always given relief to people when they were in need and local facilities could not take care of them. There is not a section represented here today but what has been the beneficiary of the Government at one time or another, and I submit there is every justification for favorable consideration of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, a point I wish to emphasize and again call attention to is that some of the people on these small farms are of necessity leaving the farm. They are going to Pennsylvania; some are going to Illinois; some to other sections of the country, and I am daily receiving letters and telegrams from people saying that this year their farms will grow up in weeds or grass, because they have nobody to work them. I am venturing the prediction that unless we can get some aid to this section of the country the defense program in the next 2 years will bog down and you will have to draft men to go on the farm and produce food for men in the front line of battle.

Further objection to the bill is based on the ground that funds already appropriated for parity payments this year are to be used in paying the grants pro-

vided in case the bill should be passed. There are two reasons why the grants should be paid from this fund. One is the possibility that cotton farmers will not receive parity payments for this next crop and it would, therefore, be unnecessary to make additional appropriations should the bill pass, and the second is that the use of such funds will in a measure compensate the farmer for the increased price on the things he buys due to the operation of the tariff law. My understanding is that the parity-payment policy established a few years ago was for the purpose of providing farmers with a benefit corresponding to that obtained by industry as a result of our protective-tariff system. That is, the parity payment in a measure is to reimburse a farmer somewhat in proportion to the amount he pays in the way of increased prices for the things he has to buy, such increase being due to custom duties or tariffs. Or, to put it another way, it was for the purpose of placing the purchasing power of the farmer on a parity with the purchasing power of the beneficiary of our tariff system. Now what is the situation with reference to these farmers we are endeavoring to assist? They have had a crop failure and there has, therefore, been a reduction in the total production of cotton to the extent of such failure and, as a result of this reduction, coupled with a number of other factors, the market price of cotton is now equal to or higher than the established parity price; consequently, under existing law, the parity funds appropriated will not be used for paying parity on cotton for this next crop. These farmers, therefore, will not receive parity payment and they are now not only suffering this loss but they will suffer the loss sustained by their crop failure and their suffering will further be increased or magnified by the fact that they must continue to pay the increased prices on the things they buy due to the operation of the tariff law. That is, if the Congress fails to act favorably on this proposition it will by its action in the passage of the tariff law and the Parity Payment Act compound the suffering of these farmers who sustained a crop disaster. Therefore, from a standpoint of equity and good conscience, I feel that the Congress should give favorable consideration to this bill.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I am urging favorable consideration of this proposal for two outstanding reasons; one is to aid a class of people in great need and who are suffering as a result of a disastrous crop failure due to causes over which they had no control, and the second is that such relief will assist in rehabilitating these people on the farm where they should be able to carry on this year and make a contribution to the general welfare of our country, our national economy, and our national defense program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, my district, consisting of 10 counties in northeast Mississippi, has suffered

a partial crop failure because of adverse weather conditions, boll weevil infestation, and other uncontrollable causes for 3 successive years. H. R. 6359, the bill now under consideration, will partially compensate the farmers of my district. They are a vital link in our national-defense program and I earnestly urge all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make it abundantly clear in the beginning that I am very sympathetic with any victim of drought, flood, or other disaster. I have reason to be, because I come from a district a part of which suffered from 7 years of continuous drought. The west part of my district is in what was known as the Dust Bowl area, and 7 years out of the last 10 that area suffered from a drought so severe that a great majority of the farmers raised absolutely nothing.

I regret that I must oppose this bill. There are many Members here who are sincerely interested in it, including some of my very close friends. However, I feel that this bill ought to be opposed and ought to be defeated for at least two very important reasons.

The first is that while this purports to be a relief bill with provision for grants or doles to individual farmers, it provides for payments on a basis other than need. I favor relief when needed. I am willing to be generous about it, but a grant from the United States Treasury should be based on need.

The gentleman from South Carolina called attention to the fact that there have been many, many relief bills passed by Congress, but I challenge him to show any bill in the nature of a relief measure which set up an insurance formula such as you have in this bill and paid no attention to the matter of need. That is the first reason.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. In the first place, this is predicated upon need.

Mr. HOPE. I disagree with the gentleman. This is not predicated on need. It is true that in this bill it is stated that an applicant must show that he is qualified to receive a loan or a grant from the Farm Security Administration, but the basis upon which he receives the grant—in this case—is not his need, the basis upon which he receives it is an insurance basis. It depends upon the amount of crop he had, the acreage of crop he had, and the extent to which that crop was a failure. It is not based on his need. He can get up to \$500 if he had a large enough acreage and a great enough failure, yet some other man may be very much more in need and he may get \$15 instead of \$500.

Mr. HARE. Under the Farm Security law, no man is able to get or is qualified for a loan or a grant unless he first shows the need. The gentleman will agree to that.

Mr. HOPE. Not entirely. I talked with the Administrator of the Farm Credit Administration this afternoon about the matter. This is in brief the

formula they use: A man must show that he is unable to secure credit at reasonable rates from some financial institution.

Mr. HARE. If he is not in need, I do not know a man who is.

Let me answer the gentleman's other proposition. The gentleman says that this is a new formula. There is no limitation on the grant the Farm Security Administration may make. They can make the sky the limit. There is no limit to the loan they can make. This formula fixes the ceiling and states that it shall not exceed a certain amount, that it shall be the difference between the actual production and 40 percent of his normal yield.

Mr. HOPE. I appreciate what the gentleman has said, but in answer to that may I say that, as far as the Farm Security Administration is concerned, there is a ceiling, and that ceiling is the need of the applicant. That is the basis upon which the Farm Security Administration administers relief, and it is the basis upon which all other direct relief acts ever passed by this Congress have been administered, as far as grants to individuals are concerned.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I think the gentleman has made a misstatement.

Mr. HOPE. I will give the gentleman some time tomorrow, and he can reply then to any misstatement I have made.

The second reason why I feel it would be a mistake to pass this measure is that it sets up an agency to duplicate what is already being done by existing agencies of this Government. I said a while ago that I come from a district which has suffered from drought for 7 years, and we had to have relief—we had to have a lot of relief. If this area we are discussing today is in bad shape after 1 year of drought, you can very easily imagine how seriously the Great Plains area was affected, with 7 years of drought.

The Farm Security Administration through its grants, the Crop Loan Office through its loans for crop-production purposes and feed, and the Production Credit Corporation for those who had assets to justify that type of credit, took care of our situation.

Those agencies exist today. I have conferred with them. I have their assurance, and the committee had their assurance when this bill was considered, that they are able and willing and ready to take care of these situations today in exactly the same way that they took care of them out in the Great Plains area and in other areas that suffered from drought or disaster during recent years.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Very briefly; yes.

Mr. FULMER. Would the gentleman be in position to state how many millions your people have got out of wheat insurance in the last 3 or 4 years?

Mr. HOPE. No; I cannot give those figures. On an average about 20 percent of the wheat producers of the country have had Government crop insurance during the 3 years it has been in operation. There have been losses in every wheat-growing State and those who have

been insured were indemnified. That was purely and simply a business proposition, they paid the premium and got the insurance. The gentleman wants to give these folks insurance when they did not pay any premium for it.

Mr. FULMER. I challenge the gentleman to show me a line in the bill that refers to insurance. But the statement was made that we have insurance for 1941. However, the President vetoed it and the farmers are not responsible for the fact they did not have it last year.

Mr. HOPE. The formula in the bill is purely an insurance formula. It is nothing but insurance. It is not based upon need, but it is based upon insurance. It gives the farmer a paid-up insurance policy for 40 percent of his normal yield, based on his allotted acreage at the parity price. It gives it to him after his crop was produced and without the payment of any premium.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY. Possibly, the gentleman could have answered our distinguished chairman by calling his attention to the fact that cotton has "rolled out the barrel" to the tune of \$2,000,000,000 and has represented less than 10 percent of the national farm income for the last 10 years.

Mr. HOPE. That is true. But I do not care how much cotton or any other crop has received. I am willing to go along and give any amount of relief that may be necessary in these drought or flood situations as long as it is based on need, and we have the agencies and the machinery set up now to furnish such information.

I want to call attention to the fact that in the State of South Carolina already this year there have been over 2,000 crop loans made for 1942 crops by the Crop Loan Administration. Last year there were something like 13,000 loans made in the State of South Carolina by the Crop Loan Administration, and over a period of the last 10 years there have been made in that State over 279,000 crop loans. Now, that administration is functioning. It has functioned during all this time and it is functioning today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOPE. Not until I have finished my statement.

The Crop Loan Administration, the set-up we have now, was created in December 1930 to take care of a situation precisely like the one you have now in the South.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. In just a moment. At that time we provided for crop loans to enable those farmers who suffered from that drought, which was a much more general drought situation than we have today, although perhaps not so devastating in some sections—we set up at that time provision for crop loans, and it has been maintained ever since.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Let me ask the gentleman to answer this question. Referring to the case of an individual farmer who made a loan like the gentleman has already enunciated for last year, and he has no crop this year, what are you going to do, make him another loan?

Mr. HOPE. Exactly.

Mr. BROOKS. How is he going to pay back last year's loan?

Mr. HOPE. The Farm Credit Administration, if the gentleman has looked into the matter, is not pushing those old loans where the farmer is unable to pay. Today in the Great Plains area there are farmers who owe back loans, perhaps, 3 or 4 years in arrears, but this does not prevent them from getting a loan for the current year if it is shown that the failure to pay was beyond the control of the borrower. All the security that a farmer has to give in a loan of this kind is a lien on the crop to be planted.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. HARE. I am very glad that the gentleman mentioned the number of loans obtained in South Carolina last year and this year. I think he said 14,000 last year, and this year 2,000.

Mr. HOPE. That is, up to date.

Mr. HARE. That supports my argument, because we obtain loans there by the end of January. We do not go out in the spring and summer and get loans, and it shows conclusively that these farmers are not getting loans this year from the Farm Security, as we did last year, or they would have them by this time.

Mr. HOPE. These were the loans made up to the end of December. I do not have the figures for the month of January, because they are not yet available; but there is no reason why the farmers of South Carolina cannot get just as many loans or more this year than last year. Ample funds are available, and I have a letter from the Farm Credit Administration saying that they are ready to take care of these loans.

Mr. HARE. But the fact is that they are not getting them, and have not got them, and will not be able to get them until it is too late.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman has a right to his opinion. I differ with him. There is no reason why these loans cannot be made this year, as they have every other year, and there will be more of them because there is more distress, and more people will call for new loans under the loan program.

In addition to that we have at this time the Farm Security Administration with its programs of grants. Those grants are available everywhere in the United States for the purpose of preventing human distress in agricultural areas. They are available in South Carolina, in Kansas, and in every State. They have been available for a number of years past. They took care of the situation in the Great Plains area, and they will take care of the situation in these areas.

Let me now call attention to some of the provisions of this bill. First, I mention the fact that the Senate has passed a bill similar to this. The bill which the Senate passed is the same as the original bill introduced in the House. That bill is on the Speaker's desk. I take it that at the proper time a motion will be made to take that bill from the Speaker's desk and substitute this bill for everything after the enacting clause. A great deal has been said about the provision in this bill which puts a limit of \$500 on the amount anyone can receive, and upon the provision which requires that one must be able to receive relief from the Farm Security Administration before he can come in under this program. However, I call attention to the fact that when this bill goes to conference, and comes back, it may or may not have these limitations, because some compromise will have to be reached between the House and the Senate bills. Since a bill has already passed the Senate without limitations, Members should not forget when they vote for this bill they may be voting for a bill which will come back from conference with quite different provisions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes more. In conclusion, do not let us establish a precedent with this bill that will plague Congress forever after. We are going to have plenty of calls upon us for relief during the next few years. What about the men who are being forced out of the automobile business and the tire business, the small business men all over the country, thousands and thousands of them, who are being forced out of business at this time? What about the people who will have to make readjustments after the war is over? What are you going to do for them? If you vote for this bill, I do not see how you can refuse when the time comes to take care of them through some insurance bill, such as this. We cannot do that. Everyone knows that we cannot do that. The people of this country are demanding that we cut nondefense expenditures, and here we have a bill no one knows how much it will cost; but, no matter how great or how little the cost will be, it will set a precedent that, if followed, will cost the Federal Treasury billions and billions of dollars in future years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS].

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration offers the only hope of affording some small measure of relief to one of the most long-suffering segments of our people—a group of our population who through no fault of their own must have help if they are to hold on, to pursue the interminable battle between man and the elements. From personal observation, I know that many skillful, hard-working farmers are at their rope's end unless something can

be done for them. Thousands of acres of fertile land ordinarily producing from one to two bales of cotton to the acre, yielded in the year 1941 only a small fraction of their customary crop. Beset by an unusually wet season and with pest infestation it required in many cases 6 to 7 acres of land to produce one bale of cotton.

If the farmers so affected are to remain on their farms to be in a position to produce in the future, if they and their families are to avoid want and starvation, this bill must be passed. The provisions of this bill will fall far short of placing them in the economic position they would have occupied except for the ravages of nature and the elements. The passage of this bill will at best tide them over on a much reduced scale. The comparatively small sum provided will pay to the country at large, and in many ways, dividends far in excess of the outlay. Good business, and the dictates of humanity both require support of this measure. May we have your aid?

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, almost the first thing I saw this morning when I awakened was an article on the front page of the paper published here indicating shortages and quotas. They referred to shortages, strange to say, of agricultural products, such as sugar, lard, and commodities of that sort, and indicated that we may in the future expect further shortages and further allotments to the consumers.

While I was waiting this opportunity to say a few words in support of this bill I picked up one of the Washington papers, and I read this article:

Women's Garb to Use Old Wool.

The first sentence is:

Women's coats and dresses in the future will have to be made from cotton, rayon, and reworked and reused wool, the War Production Board said yesterday.

I call your attention to that fact to indicate a growing shortage of agricultural commodities, of all commodities, in this country. In this war effort which we are making we must see that our people exert the maximum effort to produce not only manufactured commodities but also agricultural commodities.

Now, what is the situation we find in certain sections of the country with reference to this particular thing? What do we find, for instance, in a great portion of territory in the western part of Louisiana, in a great strip of territory in the eastern part of Texas and south Arkansas? You find that during last summer the rains descended upon that section at such times and in such quantities that the farmers literally did not produce a crop of cotton, which is the staple commodity. I hold in my hand four or five hundred postal cards from different farmers, each one individually signed, showing the quota which they normally would expect to produce in that area, and showing their actual production. I tell you members of this commit-

tee, without reading them individually, because they are here for your inspection if you want to see them, in parishes in that area in Louisiana there was a production of less than one-thirtieth of the normal crop. For instance, you find a farmer who last year produced 30 bales of cotton this year produced 1. Here is his signed statement to that effect. Those people do not have funds to begin a new crop year. They do not have funds to stay on their little farms. They are little farms, because their statements show that they have small farms.

Now, you may say that they should go out and borrow more money, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has said. The fact is that in South Carolina some 280,000 loans were made last year, which indicates clearly that those farmers were living from year to year in an effort to keep their heads above water. When something like this comes along and literally sweeps them off of the farms they are not able to go back again and borrow money this year without paying their last year's loan. It is no use to say "Loan them again," and keep on year after year pyramiding loans on these poor people who have no opportunity to pay off the old loans.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. To further substantiate what the gentleman is talking about with reference to borrowing money, one of the four points pointed out by the Farm Credit Administration as to whether they will continue making loans is this:

Provided the borrower has the capacity to work his way out of a reasonable debt burden under normal conditions.

I submit that that type of fellow could not borrow a penny of additional money.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman for his observation. If we are dead in earnest about our food-for-victory program, we must assist these farmers. Unless they are helped, a tremendous reduction in farming operations over wide areas will occur and the resulting effect on the national defense program in the long run is bound to be heavily felt.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, fundamentally this bill is the same as H. R. 6120. That bill was reported to the House on December 5. Now we have this bill, H. R. 6359, introduced on January 12 and reported on January 15. Both reports read practically the same. Again this committee comes to the House without an expression from the Secretary of Agriculture or the Bureau of the Budget on a most important bill. I am going to give you the report of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Bureau of the Budget. I secured it since this bill was called up.

The bill, H. R. 6120, was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget by the Secretary of Agriculture. It was an unfavorable letter and the Bureau of the Budget

notified the Secretary of Agriculture and notified the Congress that such legislation would not be in keeping with the President's financial program. The bill, H. R. 6359, has never been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. FULMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Just a minute. I only have 5 minutes.

Mr. FULMER. Can the gentleman produce that letter?

Mr. COCHRAN. In reply let me say I have just talked to the Bureau of the Budget. That is where I got my information. Of course, I cannot produce the letter. I communicated with the Budget Director by telephone.

Now, we have had a guess here as to the cost of this bill. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] said it was indicated to the Rules Committee that it would be \$5,000,000 but that his guess was \$20,000,000. The guess of the Bureau of the Budget is \$40,000,000.

The Bureau of the Budget called attention to subsection (B) on page 2 which indicates to the Members of this House that the money necessary to carry out the provisions of this bill will be taken out of the money already appropriated for parity payments, which will be saved. The Bureau of the Budget informed me that you are not going to save a cent of that money, and if this bill becomes law it will require another appropriation which, as I said, they estimate at \$40,000,000.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. In just a minute.

Now, you are playing Santa Claus here to the cotton farmer, to the tobacco farmer, to the dairy farmer who lost his pasture. Why do you not go on and play Santa Claus to the corn farmer, the grain farmer, the wheat farmer, and all the other farmers? Why pick out a few? If you are going to do it at all, why not do it right?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. In just a minute.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, in my opinion, has no business being on the floor of this House at a time such as we are now experiencing. What are you going to do to those who have gone into the Army at \$21 a month? Are you going to reimburse them for the difference between their salaries at the time they were called into the Army and what they are receiving now—\$21 a month? No; you are not; of course you are not; you do not have money to do it.

This bill should be defeated, and the companion bill (H. R. 6120), if it ever comes to this House, should be defeated.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman referred to the attitude of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to this particular legislation; and although this is a little aside from it, I wonder what the attitude of the Bureau of the Budget is relative to the \$300,000,000 bill to take care of about 4,000,000 people whereas this \$20,000,000

will take care of the farmers in about six or seven States?

Mr. COCHRAN. This is for 6 or 7 States out of 48. What about the other 42?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Right along that line, a farmer to get relief under this bill must show that he made less than 40 percent of a normal crop. I ask the gentleman if he thinks such a farmer does not need help?

Mr. COCHRAN. Let him go borrow from the crop-loan fund. If they cannot borrow any money because they owe, then bring in a bill giving them the right, if they can show they lost their crop, to borrow again. I will vote for a bill of that character. You should not play Santa Claus to a few farmers in six or seven States.

For 6 weeks we had rain every day last year in Missouri. The Missouri River and the Mississippi River and all the other rivers were out of their banks and overflowed the bottom lands. The farmers there did not get their wheat out, did not get their corn out, yet they are not included in this bill. Even if they were in here I would not vote for the bill, because it is not sound legislation, because the Bureau of the Budget says it might cost \$40,000,000, and if this becomes a law it will set a bad precedent for the future. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to correct a statement made by the gentleman from Missouri a moment ago as to the amount this bill would require to finance its operations.

The bill that was first introduced, according to the estimate of the department, would take \$40,000,000. No estimate has been made on the pending bill, and I challenge any man to show where the cost under the pending bill would amount to more than \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 even if the greatest amount of money that can be spent under it is used. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6359) granting relief to certain agricultural producers in stricken areas who suffered crop failures in 1941 because of adverse weather conditions, insect pests, or other uncontrollable natural causes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record on two subjects, and to include in connection therewith excerpts on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HOOK, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. SHANLEY, for 3 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HAINES, for 3 days, on account of public business.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5990. An act to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5990. An act to further the national defense and security by checking speculative and excessive price rises, price dislocations, and inflationary tendencies, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 29, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m., Thursday, January 29, 1942, for the consideration of H. R. 6482 and 6483, Defense Housing bills for the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on Wednesday, February 4, 1942, at 10 a. m., to consider all bills now pending before this committee.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 5, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 6020, granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Atlantic seaboard and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1342. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the law relating to the care and custody of insane residents of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

1343. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of funds received by Bureau of the Census to defray cost of special statistical studies, compilations, etc., from January 1 to December 31, 1941; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1344. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a joint resolution to remove certain limitations on the cost of construction of Army and Navy living quarters; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1345. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Federal Security Agency, amounting to \$11,907,035 for the fiscal year 1942, together with an amendment to the Budget for 1943 involving a decrease of \$10,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 602); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1346. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on lists of papers recommended for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1347. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to establish fees or charges for services performed or publications or forms furnished by the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1348. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Annual Report of the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1941; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1349. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting report of the Federal Works Administrator to Congress in accordance with section 311 of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1125) through November 30, 1941; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 422. Resolution providing for the expenses of continuing the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 125, of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session and continued by House Resolution 403, of the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session; without amendment (Rept. No. 1686). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 6440. A bill to authorize the renewal of the lease of the old naval hospital in the District of Columbia for an additional period of 15 years; without amendment (Rept. No. 1703). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6434. A bill to authorize the attendance of personnel of the Army of the United States as students at educational institutions and other places; without amendment (Rept. No. 1704). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6293. A bill to establish a Woman's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1705). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1891. An act to amend an act to provide allowances for uniforms and equipment for

certain officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army so as to provide allowances for uniforms and equipment for certain officers of the Army of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1706). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2430. A bill for the relief of John Huff; with amendment (Rept. No. 1687). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTINGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3610. A bill for the relief of Minnie C. Sanders, and Henry G. Sanders, her husband; with amendment (Rept. No. 1688). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4303. A bill for the relief of Henrietta Moritz; with amendment (Rept. No. 1689). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5048. A bill for the relief of Julia Peterson Mills; with amendment (Rept. No. 1690). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5478. A bill for the relief of Nell Mahoney; without amendment (Rept. No. 1691). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5572. A bill to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12 1940," approved April 23 1941; without amendment (Rept. No. 1692). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6225. A bill for the relief of certain individuals in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fort Hall Indian Irrigation project, Idaho; without amendment (Rept. No. 1693). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. S. 806. An act for the relief of Carmilla Ridgewell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1694). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. S. 1266. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Etta Houser Freeman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1695). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 1654. An act for the relief of the Merchants Distilling Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1696). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 1771. A bill for the relief of E. V. Thurston and Joseph Hardy, a partnership; without amendment (Rept. No. 1697). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. S. 1778. An act for the relief of Leslie Truax; without amendment (Rept. No. 1698). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 1648. An act for the relief of Dr. Hugh G. Nicholson; without amendment

(Rept. No. 1699). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. S. 1974. An act for the relief of Francis Howard Robinson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1700). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCHULTE: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 381. An act for the relief of Marcel M. Roman, Clara M. Roman, and Rodica E. Roman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1701). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCHULTE: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 3036. A bill for the relief of Max Delfiner and his wife Evy (Ewa); without amendment (Rept. No. 1702). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 6482. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 6483. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 6484. A bill to suspend during the present war the running of statutes of limitations applicable to certain offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 6485. A bill authorizing the direct purchase of Government obligations by Federal Reserve banks, and regulating the manner in which the earnings of such banks shall be distributed; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H. R. 6486. A bill to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 6487. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 6488. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in peanuts, and for other purposes," approved April 3, 1941, so as to authorize the sale of excess peanuts for seed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 423. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 6446, a bill to provide for continuing payment of pay and allowances of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including the retired and Reserve components thereof, and civilian employees of the Navy Department, during periods of absence from post of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 424. Resolution to amend clause 24, and clause 40, rule XI, of the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the

United States to consider their Senate Joint Resolution No. 10, relative to military protection for the State of California; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 6489. A bill for the relief of I. Arthur Kramer and Georgene Kramer (a minor); to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6490. A bill for the relief of Lenora B. Morris; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 6491. A bill for the relief of the heirs of John W. Adams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHUETZ:

H. R. 6492. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Kowalczyk; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2336. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of Mrs. Essi Shively and 50 members of the Blue River Church of the Brethren, in Whitley County, Ind., urging Members of the House and Senate to vote for Senate bill 860, a bill to control the sale of alcoholic beverages in the vicinity of military and naval establishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2337. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the senate and the assembly of the State of California, respectfully urging Congress to enact such legislation as is best designed to insure the State of California a home guard under the supervision of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2338. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the International Railway Association, opposing passage of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2339. By Mr. WELCH: Senate Joint Resolution No. 10 of the California State Legislature, relative to protection of national defense industries, utilities, and facilities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2340. Also, Joint Resolution No. 20 of the California State Assembly, relative to memorializing the President and Congress to amend the Federal Social Security Act to permit certain small income to aged and dependent beneficiaries in addition to the aid which they may receive under Federal, State, and local laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2341. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Philadelphia Industrial Union Counsel, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the price-control bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 29, 1942

(Legislative day of Friday, January 23, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, the Very Reverend Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and unchangeable God, in whom alone we find rest for our weariness